THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

o. 8. NOVEMBER. 1934. Vol. XXIV.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

E Dean's Farewell.

Decanus noster—for he is our Dean in a sense in which no ner Dean is—has taken his formal farewell of St. Paul's. We glad that he has not passed from us in silence, but in his *le*[1] has presented 'the City and the world' with a clear-cut pression of the experience and lessons of his life. Sentiment- ty, false modesty and rancour are entirely absent from his edictory. Mr. Bernard Shaw once described Dr. Inge as 'the atest intellectual asset of the Church of England.' All who ow him realize that he will rank with Colet and Donne and urch, the most distinguished of his predecessors. Some be- ve that he will rank as the greatest of them all, but that must pend, in some degree, upon how this age ranks in the annals our history in which the Dean has been so commanding and uential a figure. Will this age appear in retrospect as one of greatest, or one of the meanest? Notwithstanding all the k of post-war decadence and the breakdown of civilization, we inclined to believe that the England which not only fought great war, but has since striven, if with only partial success, win the great peace, and so secure a new era for civilization, l not be regarded without an admiration as sincere as that ch we pay to 'the spacious times of Great Elizabeth.'

[1] *Vale.* By the Very Rev. W. R. Inge, K.C.V.O., D.D. (Longmans, en & Co., 1934; 3/6.)

The Dean's *obiter dicta* in this his latest volume are not ne and are not intended to be new. They reflect and reiterate th judgments of a ripe and many-sided experience. The best tr bute we can offer to him on this occasion is to direct the attentic of our readers to some of these utterances.

It is natural to turn first to the Dean's views on Modernisn He was brought up in a beautiful Tractarian home penetrate by the ideals of *The Christian Year*. That home was intensel 'anti-Modernist'; 'the very idea of evolution in doctrine wa anathema,' yet as the Dean writes:

> 'It became clear to me, as soon as I began to think seriously abo the foundations of belief, that the centre of gravity in religion h shifted, in our day, from authority to experience. To ascribe infal bility to the pronouncements of the institutional Church seems almo monstrous. Nothing can be more fantastic than the Tractarian theo that the General Councils were infallibly guided, but that the gift infallibility went into abeyance when the Church was divided. . . .'

The Dean's view of the service which science can perfor for religion is summed up for him in the saying of von Hügel 'Science is the Purgatory of religion,' which means, as the Dea explains, that 'it cleanses religion from many unworthy belie about God, man and the world.'

To-day, when the popular and growing prevalence of inte national ideals is being seized upon by ecclesiastics to proclai the inherent superiority of an imperial Church over nation Churches, it is interesting to find the Dean writing:

> 'I am strongly in favour of national Churches. The idea of a un versal Church is as obsolete and chimerical as that of an Empire, whi is its counterpart' (p. 102).

The Dean, as a Platonist and a Christian, has naturally muc in common with Catholic theologians. He writes:

> 'My only serious difference from them is in their dualism of th natural and the supernatural. Even the most liberal Catholics see unable to see the objections to a theory which intercalates acts of Go into the order of nature' (p. 109).

In face of the present moral confusion and the doubts an difficulties with which the serious student of the Gospels is face the Dean has no doubt that Jesus did present a comprehensib and practical ethical ideal which is capable of regeneratin humanity:

> 'I think that a clear outline of universal ethics can be found in th Gospels as they stand, and that certain principles of inexhaustible valu

can be drawn from these records, even if we have to admit numerous accretions which are due to the apostolic Church and not to the Founder Himself. I emphasize the law of inwardness—"from within, out of the heart of man"; the supremacy of love over justice; the law of gain through pain, of victory through sacrifice; the indignation of Christ towards three things—hypocrisy, hard-heartedness and worldliness; the new virtues for which the Church needed new names—love, joy, humility, faith and hope. These, I think, constitute a definite moral ideal, based on a definite standard of values, which had never been so clearly taught before' (p. 96).

Much of the Dean's great influence is due, not simply to his clear thinking, but also to his courage. He was the first of prominent clergymen to support publicly the eugenic campaign at a time when to do so was regarded as 'unsavoury,' if not positively immoral. The cause he supported in the face of obloquy has won its way even in ecclesiastical circles. The Dean writes:

'It must soon be admitted by all, except those for whom discussion is precluded by the supposed obligation not to dispute Catholic authority, that the morality of restricting the family depends on the motive, and that the motive is often good. When my advice is asked by a young couple, I say, "Let two children be born, and afterwards do what you think best for them and for yourselves." As I have had five children myself, I cannot be accused of advocating what has been rather absurdly called race-suicide.'

The Dean's teaching on Sacraments is marked by a combination of reverence for scientific research and reverence for religious feeling. In summarizing his sacramental teaching he writes:

'Rudimentary sacraments are found in primitive religions in connection with sacrifices. The ideas which they express are (1) the establishment of guest-friendship with the god; (2) acquisition of divine qualities by sacramentally eating the gifts of the god or the flesh of his totem-animal; (3) atonement for sin by the sacrfice of the totem-animal, which represents both the god and his worshippers. The idea of sacrifice is realized when priest, victim, deity and worshippers are made *one*. In the Greek mysteries or sacraments the boon conferred was immortality or deification. The sacrament of admission consisted chiefly of ceremonial washing; the sacrament of membership, of a common meal. The Christian sacraments are thus the simplest and most universal of all sacramental rites. The elements in the Jewish sacramental worship which our Lord wished to exclude were bloody sacrifices and sacerdotalism. Among the accretions which gathered round the primitive Christian sacraments, chiefly from the Greek mysteries, were (1) symbolism, the sacraments as mystical symbols of spiritual truths; (2) secrecy; (3) materialization of the doctrine of sacramental grace; (4) ritualism and spectacular worship; (5) the idea of the sacraments as "the medicine of immortality." These are not all unhealthy developments. The attempt to dispense with symbols in religion is a mistake;

> the relation of the outward to the inward is real. . . . The dignity of the priestly calling is prophetic rather than sacerdotal. In the Eucharist it is an eternal act that we represent, not a temporal act that we repeat. The great sacraments are intended to teach us that all life is, in various degrees, sacred and sacramental. In particular, the Eucharist should help us to realize the deep mystery of our relation to our fellow-men, which perfect love alone can solve.'

The conclusion of the whole matter from the Dean's point of view—and it is a conclusion which protects the sacredness of personality and leaves the road open to religious progress—is that: '

> We cannot make a religion for others, and we ought not to let others make a religion for us. Our own religion is what life has taught us.'

Christians and Jews.

In days when Herr Hitler and his *régime* are striving to compel the German Reformed Churches to exclude from their membership and ministry all who are of Jewish descent, it is not without significance that we have published in this country a volume of religious essays[2] contributed by well-known Jewish and Christian scholars—'the first Jewish-Christian Symposium ever published,' so the Dean of Canterbury, who contributes a foreword, asserts.

Among Christian contributors are Dean Matthews, Prof. Raven, Canon Streeter, Prof. C. C. J. Webb, Prof. Burkitt and Prof. Oman; among the Jewish contributors are the Rabbi Mattuck, Dr. C. G. Montefiore, Dr. Loewe, the Hon. Lily Montague and the Rabbi Reinhart. The editor, Mr. G. A. Yates, is a Jew. The themes dealt with are for religious readers of the highest interest. They include:

> The Approach to God, The Reality of God, The Defeat of Pain, The Problem of Evil, The Atonement, Social Teaching for To-day, The Devotional Life, The Nature of Revelation, Jewish Conceptions of Immortality, The Nature of Religious Experience, The Place of the Law in Modern Jewish Teaching, The Place of Jesus in Modern Christian Thought, The Abiding Significance of Apocalyptic, Christian Views of Judaism, Jewish Views of Christianity.

The level of courtesy, sympathy and insight of these contributions constitutes a model for religious discussion between those who differ.

The Dean of Canterbury relates in his Foreword the follow-

[2] *In Spirit and in Truth.* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1934; 7/6.)

ng story, which indicates how much religious ground is possessed in common by Jew and Christian:

'Once, at a solemn moment in a great concourse on Armistice Day, the Lord's Prayer was about to be read. A hand was pressed on my shoulder. A quiet voice whispered in my ear, "We too can pray this prayer with you, every word of it." An aged Rabbi spoke, and his words were true.'

The Epilogue of this volume consists of two prayers taken rom the liturgy of the Society of Jews and Christians. These rayers many may be glad to use in our Church services, particularly on Good Friday:

Almighty God, Who makest all men one, we pray for all those who seek to do Thy will, whether they be called Jew or Christian. Though many differences in thought and belief divide us, yet let the desire to serve Thee, the love of truth and pursuit of righteousness unite us. Strengthen the spirit of brotherhood among us and increase mutual understanding between us. Help us to look to that day when a greater knowledge of Thee and Thy word shall bind all who would serve Thee into one holy fellowship, when the world may be renewed in righteousness and God may be all in all. *Amen.*

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we humbly ask Thee to give us understanding to work for the advancement of those aims which are righteous, so that our country may be established in the righteousness which exalteth a nation. Quicken our sense of responsibility as citizens, that together we may seek to remove ignorance, crime and poverty, fight against all evil in the relations between men and nations, and work for the establishment of social justice and universal peace. We pray Thee give us a spirit of goodwill towards all peoples and all nations. Help us to remove the strife of conflicting interests, so that the life of mankind may be purified and enlarged in goodness. Do Thou in Thy holy Spirit bind all men unto Thee in love, devotion and obedience, and unto one another in the quest for truth and justice, and in the spirit of brotherhood. *Amen.*

ONFIRMATION AND EXPLAINING AWAY THE CREED.

At the first Joint Conference of Headmasters and Headistresses at Harpenden, held on Oct. 25, Miss H. V. Stuart Headmistress of Sherborne School for Girls) complained of the ifficulties of religious education being increased by our Church ormularies. She asserted that those who prepared girls for onfirmation were handicapped 'by always having to explain ings away.' She continued (as reported in the *Times*, Oct. 26, 934):

'The clergy said that it did not matter what the words meant so long as the spirit of them was understood; but the children had to take a very solemn oath, and it was a serious thing if teachers had to tell them that it did not matter if they did not mean what they said.'

The difficulty is a very real one. First, because the English mind is a very literal mind; and, secondly, because its literalness is being increased by modern scientific education. Accuracy of thought demands accuracy of language, as Socrates stressed in Athens 400 B.C. The modern teacher, though untrained in the Platonic Dialogues, demands, whether he be religious or irreligious, that the formularies he has to use in teaching his pupils shall be literally accurate. It is difficult to make religion real to the schoolboy and schoolgirl to-day, but the sense of unreality is increased when Christian formularies have to be explained as not meaning what they say nor saying what they mean. Yet it would be quite possible to make them do so if our authorities would seriously take up the matter of dogmatic reform. Many of them do not recognize the need for it because they live in a world where this need is never felt. No one whose time is spent, as a bishop's must be, in a perpetual ecclesiastical round, in close association with the clergy and ecclesiastically-minded laity, will feel the stress of the need of dogmatic reform.

Any interested and open-minded Churchman in the undergraduate world of the Universities, in the great public schools, in those many male societies which exist for every purpose except the ecclesiastical, realizes that the lack of dogmatic reform has managed to bang, bar and bolt the Church's door against vast multitudes who in character and conduct are at least as Christian as those inside the Church. Cardinal Newman once pathetically complained that bad men felt no more difficulty about affirming the creeds than did good men. The *credenda* which are causing the trouble are not really the things that matter morally and spiritually to-day. That is one of the most distressing features of the situation. These *credenda* are the heritage of the past; and as that past is sacrosanct in the eyes of traditionalists, it may neither be altered nor dispensed with in any particular; and those who, in the interests of truth, comprehensiveness and freedom, demand dogmatic reform, are viewed as wolves in sheep's clothing. The misfortune is that, in many cases, in their anxiety to exclude the wolves, the Church authorities are admitting only the rabbits.

Mr. St. John Ervine rightly contended, at the recent Birmingham Conference, that it was impossible to secure a 'fool-proof'

rayer Book; that Church people must be educated so as to nderstand the character and significance of their religious eritage; that to eliminate every archaism and every phrase pen to misunderstanding in our Prayer Book would be to vul- arise it. This is certainly true; but where, as the Headmistress Sherborne points out, the Prayer Book is concerned with firmations of the Faith which are of the nature of vows that ust be taken if full Church membership is to be possessed, nen the need for strict truthfulness, whether by elimination or y modification, is essential. Not to provide it, is surely to sin gainst Christ's little ones, as it is to sin against truth.

In writing thus we may be charged with having forgotten the ork which is being done by the Doctrinal Commission ap- ointed by the Archbishops. That Commission was appointed 1923. It has therefore been at work more than ten years. The te Archbishop of Canterbury is reported to have said to those ho complained of the excessive time taken in the revision which roduced the *Deposited Book*, 'The longer it takes, the better will be.' Possibly this also expresses the mind of the Doctrinal ommission. But any student of the Revisions of our English turgy in 1549, 1552, 1559, 1604 and 1662 will consider ten ears an excessive period for the work of the Commission. ranmer, the prince of English liturgical reformers, was wise ough to publish samples of the work achieved from time to me, and was thus enabled, during the process of revision, both educate his public and to test it. May we venture to suggest at if the Commission cannot present us shortly with a complete port, they should at least issue interim reports showing defi- tely what has been accomplished hitherto and what is the haracter of their practical proposals.

RTH CONTROL IN AMERICA.

The *Spectator* of October 26, 1934, which in addition to its nglish circulation has a large American circulation, publishes e following item :

> 'In many respects the forces of conservatism in America are far more powerful than in England. They have up to now effectually barred the way to legislation which would enable hospitals or doctors to give advice on the question of birth control. One of the principal obstacles to the removal of the ban was the influence of the Protestant

Episcopal Church, whose High Church members have generally held very strict views on the matter. But even in this stronghold of orthodoxy opinion has been changing. The House of Bishops has just carried a resolution by 44 votes to 38 in favour of allowing licensed physicians, hospitals and medical clinics to convey information in accordance with "the highest principles of eugenics and a more wholesome family life." This is a remarkable victory for the more liberal view; it means that legislation hitherto strongly opposed by Episcopalians will have a good chance of getting through Congress.'

George Herbert wrote a prophetic couplet which caused no little difficulty to the ecclesiastical censors of the Press in his day, but which has been on more than one occasion fulfilled:

'Religion stands at tip-toe in our land
Ready to pass to the American strand.'

We do well to remember that the victory which the *Spectator* justly claims, was really won, not in the American House of Bishops, but in the last Lambeth Conference. Both in the sphere of theological development and that of ethical evolution the last Lambeth Conference has solid achievements to its credit.

Presbyterian Modernism in Tennessee.

We regret that our contemporary *The Presbyterian Advance*, edited by James E. Clarke in the State of Tennessee, which has been conducting for some time past an unequal campaign on behalf of Modernism, has succumbed. We have known many Modernist journals, vigorously and bravely conducted, which have shared a similar fate. Doubtless it is the fate of the virtuous to die young. The citizen of the world, however, would briefly reply that death was due to lack of subscribers. The Editor of *The Presbyterian Advance* assigns two causes to the extinction of his journal: (1) the lack of enthusiastic and self-sacrificing co-operation by Modernists; (2) the 'obstructive and defamatory activities of the small—and already shrinking—group of men who have for years persistently misrepresented the Church of which they continue ministers, and so have obstructed the task to which Christians are called.'

The valedictory of the retiring editor is characteristic:

'All through the ages many have seen what has now come to be the dominant belief of intelligent Christians. It is that "Christianity" is essentially not a belief, a creed, a "system of thought," but a quality of *life*. Hence mere creeds always have and still do differ mainly in non-essentials, for the one thing always essential is that expressed by

Jesus when he said, "I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly." This is the very essence of "Modernism"—the view that the individual is not to be saved, that society is not to be redeemed, by the intellectual acceptance of some system or creed believed to be true; but only by such a surrender to the Living Spirit that life is transformed by his indwelling.

'Has this sort of "Modernism" actually "triumphed over the largest denominations?" Frankly, we gravely fear that it has not. We fear that to this day a majority of church members think of Christianity as a matter of form and creed. But if such "Modernism" has won a "sweeping victory" in the councils of our own church and other great denominations—and it certainly has among those willing to think and permit the spirit to lead as Jesus promised he would do—then let us thank God and take courage. It means that the day of narrow and bitter sectarianism is rapidly passing and that the new day is dawning when the dogmatic spirit will be exorcised and the Spirit of the Christ will dominate in human life as it never yet has done.

'Such "Modernism" has already brought to many a new vision of what life may be and what the Church may do, and a new fellowship among those of widely different views and opinions who, nevertheless, are one in their purpose to reproduce the life that was in Jesus and apply his spirit and principles in every sphere of human activity. May God hasten that day when that vision is universal among all who call themselves Christians.'

The dangers which beset Modernism are lack of belief in ne necessity for organization and in the necessity for creeds. he Christian religion requires both. But of course both organiion and formularies should be in harmony with the Spirit of rist. A Modernism which will not be at the pains to organize d will not be at the pains to formulate its religious and ethical nvictions with precision, cannot expect to advance, however endid its ideals and however disinterested its spirit.

These recurring fights between Traditionalists and Modern- the next age will no doubt look back upon as fights in the rk, in which the victory to be won is not the triumph of Tradinalists over Modernists, or Modernists over Traditionalists, t the achievement of a higher synthesis in which the position d essential convictions for which both parties stand are united. he best work of Modernism can be done, not in creating new ganizations, but in adjusting old ones to a new moral and ritual environment.

The Conclusion of the Angus Case.

If Modernism in the Presbyterian Church has suffered a erse in Tennessee, it has gained a notable triumph in an

immensely more important sphere—the Australian Commonwealth. The case of Prof. Angus of Sydney, having been for some four years past before various Presbyterian courts and assemblies, reached its goal when the five final appeals were heard and adjudicated on by the Judicial Commission of the Presbyterian Church of Australia on September 21, 1934. In one respect there is something Gilbertian in the findings of the Judicial Commission, since the Commission decided that Dr. Angus was not technically on trial, nor ever had been, in view of the fact that no charge has ever been formally laid or any judicial process initiated against him in any one of the lower courts of the Church. The Commission also recognized, with a Scottish shrewdness, that no bare verdict could do justice to the parties involved nor to the immensely serious problems claiming solution.

The Judicial Commission, in treating the appeals in the Angus case, recognize that the essential element in the Christian religion is 'the believing estimate' which recognizes Jesus Christ as God and Man; and here it is of interest to note that they affirm that it is as heretical to speak of Him as God alone as to speak of Him as Man alone. He is the God-Man, and both terms when applied to Him are indispensable. The Commission also recognize that distinct from 'the believing estimate' is 'the intellectual expression of that estimate.' Whilst 'the believing estimate'—in other words, the essential Christian Faith—should be the common possession of all Christians, the intellectual expression will and must vary from age to age, and in consequence there must be a large freedom permitted in the form which this intellectual expression assumes. Christian unity is found, not in the 'intellectual expression,' but in 'the believing estimate.'

The Commission also recognize that 'down the ages God has been giving His Church a wider knowledge and a larger experience, and the Church has not merely the right, but the duty, constantly and firmly to use these gifts of God to enable her to formulate and to proclaim with fresh power the ever-living Gospel.'

The judicial decision is thus reported by the *Sydney Telegraph* of September 22, 1934:

> In view of these considerations, the Commission found itself bound

to ask whether, on the material before it, a *prima facie* case had been made out for directing the initiation of a judicial process.

On examining the relevant books of which Dr. Angus is the author, the Commission found that he denies that the fourth century intellectual expression of that faith is adequate to our present time.

But there is also positive evidence that Dr. Angus holds the 'believing estimate' itself.

It is not too much to say that his spiritual expression of that estimate is impressive.

But is his own intellectual expression of it adequate to conserve the essential substance of the Church's Catholic and age-long faith?

This was tested during the public hearing in two ways:—

(1) Dr. Angus was asked whether he could briefly distinguish his expression of Christian doctrine from that of Unitarianism, and replied that his philosophy is such as to make the Unitarian position 'absolutely impossible' to him.

(2) We recognise that Dr. Angus has difficulties with that expression of the Church's faith found in its existing Subordinate Standards.

Dr. Angus intimated that he accepted the following statement, which had been tentatively approved by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1934:—

'The Church, knowing GOD through JESUS CHRIST His Son, and through the working of His Spirit in the lives of believers, confesses and adores one GOD — Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.'

The Commission accepts Dr. Angus's further affirmation that he holds the New Testament doctrine of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, without mental reservation.

The *Sydney Morning Herald* of September 21, 1934, adds ie interesting details of the procedure of the Commission. er 'a spirited speech' by Dr. Angus, in which he declared he could not withdraw or explain away any of the doctrinal mations made in his book *Truth and Tradition*, Dr. Kenneth ward delivered an able defence which had a decisive effect he judgment of the Commission. Dr. Edward said:

'It had been argued that the only question to be decided was whether the views of Dr. Angus were in accord with the actual credal standards literally interpreted, and as they existed to-day. The Church, however, had declared that those standards were under revision. It seemed to many of them grossly unfair, unreasonable, and un-Christian that there should be a demand for a decision on a question such as that of standards which the Church had already, by its action, declared to be under revision. The appellants might argue as they liked that no revision of the Church standards would include the views of Dr. Angus, but it was possible that the Church might adopt a position which did not seek to exclude all those who were out of accord with a particular type of theological statement.

'Dr. Angus was approached in such a way as to demand his acceptance of certain beliefs. The case of the accusers of Dr. Angus concerning the doctrine of the Trinity rested on the demand that Dr. Angus should be judged in the light of the standards as they existed to-day.

'Any attempt on the part of Dr. Angus, or any of us, to explain the ancient symbol of the Trinity is lightly turned aside, and we are asked whether we are Trinitarians in the sense of the words of the Confession.

'The charge laid against Dr. Angus could be laid against a number of modern students of theology. The appellants were determined to demand belief in a certain mode of the Resurrection. I will be very surprised if any Christian Church, in its official credal statement of the future, will make the bodily resurrection of our Lord a vital aspect of its faith.'

Australians are not interested in theology nor in dogmatic discussions; but the extraordinary interest excited in the Commonwealth by the Angus heresy-hunt testifies to Australian admiration for the courage and ability with which Dr. Angus has maintained his convictions. But in this public enthusiasm there is something more than admiration for Dr. Angus: there is the underlying conviction that he is standing for a religion which seeks to be true and vital; an affair of character and conduct; a power which might uplift and transform the national life of Australia.

The Challenge of the *Church Times*.

As the result of the wide publicity given to the transactions of the recent Conference of Modern Churchmen at Birmingham, numerous attacks have been made on English Modernists. One contemporary, the *Church Times*, ever eager to discover wherein we differ from it and so wherein we ought to be condemned, published the following letter (October 5th, 1934) from the Secretary of the Modern Churchmen's Union in reply to its diatribes. Mr. Wood's letter seems to us to express so concisely and incisively the real points at issue that we desire to place it on record in our pages.

Sir,—I thank you for your reply to my letter, for it brings to light the issue which divides you from the Modern Churchmen's Union, and which must be faced honestly by the Church as a whole, namely, the freedom of interpretation of the Creeds. It is the difference in attitude of mind towards this question, combined in some quarters with an intellectual incapacity to understand the points at issue, which annually makes the Modern Churchmen's Conference the centre of criticism and misguided abuse.

'Are not the Creeds part of the Church's law?' The very form of your question implies assumptions which we challenge. It assumes firstly, that the Church is a definite, organized, body, capable of mak-

ing 'laws' governing not only the conduct of its members, but dictating precisely what they shall think about matters of history, philosophy, and theology, 'which, except everyone do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.'

It assumes, secondly, that these laws (*i.e.* the Creeds) are so immutable and infallible that even the mere questioning of any article of them is such disloyalty as to merit exclusion from the pulpit, if not expulsion from the Church.

'Such assumptions appear to us to have nothing to do with the religion of Christ. The analogy from society and its laws is false. Must an Englishman, who thinks that any one of his country's laws needs amendment, become an exile? Where would he find a community with whose legal code he was in complete agreement? Must he in default thereof become a Flying Dutchman? Surely his duty is to serve his commonwealth as it is, and to endeavour to get the laws amended by all legal means within his power.

The analogy is also wrongly applied. Toleration of criticism, freedom of speech, and certainly freedom of thought, are characteristic of progressive, civilized communities. It is the last tyranny of a totalitarian State to seek to dictate the very thoughts of its members.

The analogy of Creeds to laws is, indeed, fundamentally unsound. The Church is not a rigid institution, whose Creeds are like 'the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not.' It is a spiritual organism with freedom to adapt its life and forms to meet the varying knowledge and needs of different ages and climes, just because its Lord is a Living Lord, and its guide a Living Spirit. Its Creeds are not inert moulds into whose Procrustean limits all human thought must be forced. The freedom of interpretation is necessary to make them instruments of a living faith, and it is claimed not only by Modernists but by Catholics and Evangelicals alike. Rigidity belongs to Tennessee and to Rome. (But is not 'development' only another name for re-interpretation?)

Surely this is flogging a dead horse? The right of re-interpretation has been conceded in the Church of England long ago. Are you going back on *Lux Mundi?* Of course, it will be said, 'But there is a limit to the right of criticism; thus far shalt thou go and no farther.' But can this limitation be applied, and by whom? The principle knows no obvious limitation, and it is useless for Catholics to quote 'traditional orthodoxy' to those who go beyond them, when they themselves have amended that standard where it pleased them to do so.

'What other authority can there be but the living, developing, self-adapting, mind of the whole Body of Christ's disciples? In that Body the Modernists claim the right to be numbered, and to that mind they contribute no less than traditionalists and fundamentalists, and for their right to do so they appeal not only to the history of the Church but to the God Whose Law of Truth and Love is above the traditions of the Church.

T. J. Wood.

We do not think that a better statement of the right of dernists to re-interpret ancient formularies in the light of dern truth could be made.

A Christian Demand for Marriage Law Reform.

In view of a further effort to secure the reform of our mar riage and divorce laws the Council of the Modern Churchmen' Union has issued the following statement to all members c Parliament and other persons of influence :

The Present Position.

It is now twenty-two years since a large Majority of the Roy Commission on Divorce recommended that certain grounds should b allowed upon which aggrieved persons might ask the permission the Court for relief. They were (1) Adultery, (2) Desertion for thre years, (3) Persistent cruelty, (4) Incurable insanity after five year confinement, (5) Habitual drunkenness found incurable after thre years, and (6) Imprisonment for life under a commuted death sentenc In 1920 under the guidance of Dean Rashdall, the Churchmen's Uni produced a report giving general assent to the above grounds, ar strongly supporting the condemnation by the Commissioners of pe manent Separation Orders granted by Magistrates. In the meantim the anomalies and injustice of the present law have become intensifie and it has seemed good to us to state again what our views as Churc men are with reference to these questions. It should be remembe that England is the only Christian country in the world which clin tenaciously to prohibitions from divorce which stand so much in t way of human happiness and morality.

Let us say at the outset that our aim is to secure and maintain t highest Christian ideal of marriage, *i.e.* life-long monogamy, so th any law which runs counter to the Christian standard of marriage a morals cannot be Christian.

But we believe that changes in the law are essential not only f the purpose of widening the grounds of divorce but also in order t strengthen the institution of marriage and to discourage the reckles ness and frivolity with which to-day marriages are frequently co tracted. The present state of the law is gravely injurious to pub morals.

There are some Churchmen who hold that Christ's words in *S Mark* and *St. Luke* constitute an absolute prohibition to the 'puttin away' of a wife. This view was so completely dealt with in our Repo of 1920 by Dean Rashdall that we may merely remind our readers (1) that our Lord was not legislating, but laying down a general pri ciple, (2) that His words were spoken in relation to a specific contr versy as to the Jewish law at the time, whereby a man could divor his wife for any cause whatsoever, (3) that He did not regard adulte as necessarily the worst of sins; to the woman taken in adultery He reported to have said 'Neither do I condemn thee. Go and sin n more.'

We challenge the basis of the present law which prescribes adulte as the only ground for divorce, and indeed to base a Divorce law o adultery only is to observe the letter of a disputed text, and to ignor the spirit of our Lord's teaching about which there should be n dispute.

Adultery and Desertion as Grounds for Divorce.

In recent years it has been common for parties to obtain a divorce by means of faked adultery, whereby they hire a stranger to accompany them to a hotel in order that evidence may be obtained of adultery, which does not actually take place. This may enable them to obtain a decree by means of perjury, seeing that they have to swear an affidavit that no collusion has taken place. To obviate this the Court, in effect, says to them, 'You must actually commit adultery, otherwise we will not grant you relief.' We emphatically condemn this state of things which directly encourages perjury on the one hand, and immorality on the other.

We recommend that—

(1) Adultery should cease to be in itself a ground for *immediate* divorce but should be a ground for temporary separation in all Courts, such separation to be converted at the option of either party into divorce after six months, provided that in no case shall the decree take effect until three years from the date of marriage.

While we appreciate the necessity for Separation Orders in certain circumstances, we hold strongly that the majority of these ought to be terminated within a period of years, either by agreement or by divorce. Recently 17,097 Separation Orders were granted in one year only by Police Courts (which Orders do not include separations by agreement, or High Court Decrees) and the unfortunate parties are left, without freedom to remarry, to form illicit unions, and to bring illegitimate children into the world. This condition of affairs is not in the interests of public morality.

We recommend that—

(2) Wilful desertion for three years should be a ground for divorce.

Were both these reforms introduced, frivolous marriages would be checked, since no final relief could be obtained for at least three years; the undesirable prominence of adultery would probably cease, as the majority of unhappy couples would here, as in Scotland and elsewhere, prefer the more decent, and, we would add, the more Christian, procedure for divorce for desertion, and the inducement to collusive adultery would be removed.

The King's Proctor.

To meet the case where, during the interval between the Separation Order and the final Decree, the petitioner may have committed adultery.

We recommend that—

(3) The functions of the King's Proctor should be abolished. A Decree should not be refused on the sole ground that the petitioner has committed adultery; the whole circumstances of the marriage should be investigated, and such relief granted as will best protect the interests of the parties, and children, if any.

We take exception to the view that relief should be refused where both parties have broken the moral law, and we are convinced that the efforts of the law to prevent this have failed, and are bad for public morals. In practice the King's Proctor only interferes with his official espionage in the most flagrant cases, the majority of them passing to a Decree Absolute without investigation, and we believe that his activities have been on the whole harmful. Divorce should not be regarded as a reward for the bad conduct of one party, or the pro-

fessed good conduct of the other, and we say frankly that a refusal o relief of a husband or wife, who has already proved the adultery of th partner, is unsatisfactory if the ground for so doing is that, since th Decree Nisi, the petitioner has also committed adultery. To insis upon the continuance of such a marriage is, in our opinion, both un Christian and undesirable.

Reconciliation.

The present Divorce Court makes no attempt to enquire into th circumstances of the marriage, or to bring about a reconciliation. Th matter is regarded purely as a matter of law, and only lawyers dea with it. An undefended case takes on the average about five minutes and that is all the Judge sees of it. This want of investigation wi become more urgent when the number of Poor Persons' cases in creases in the future. We realize the difficulty where respondent refuse to appear in Court, but we believe that they are more likely t appear in a social investigation than in litigation pure and simple. Police Courts applications for Separation Orders are often relegated t the Probation Officer or Missionary to investigate, and to try to effe a reconciliation, and in quite an appreciable number of cases the succeed. The usual procedure of a Court of Summary Jurisdiction i not ideal for dealing with matrimonial disputes. These should dealt with in special private sittings. Mutual recriminations in a pub Court do not tend towards a reconciliation.

We rejoice to see the appointment of a Departmental Committ of the Home Office on the application of reconciliation methods matrimonial disputes in a Court of Summary Jurisdiction, and should welcome a change in the law which would avoid undue publi in these cases.

Persistent Cruelty.

The Majority Report of the Commission recommended persiste cruelty as a ground for divorce. It has been objected that persiste cruelty is hard to define, but for years it has been a ground for Separation Order in Police Courts where no serious difficulty has be found in applying those two words to a given state of facts. We ho strongly that prolonged cruelty should be a ground for divorce after period of three years.

We recommend that—

(4) Divorce should be granted on the ground of persistent cruel after a marriage has lasted for three years. Before that time relief shou be, as now, by Separation, such being converted, as we have recom mended for adultery, into divorce after three years from the marriage

Habitual Drunkenness.

Among the grounds recommended by the Report is Habitu Drunkenness. It has been urged that this again is difficult to defin but the definition given by the Report, *viz.*, that a habitual drunkar 'is a person who uses or takes habitually any intoxicants or drug and while under the influence, or in consequence of their effects, is times (*a*) dangerous to himself, or a cause of terror to others, or cause of serious harm or suffering to members of his family, or (*c*) i capable of managing his affairs,' seems comprehensive and adequat although somewhat cumbersome.

Incurable Insanity.

There remains Incurable Insanity after five years' confinement, and Imprisonment for life under a commuted death sentence.

We recommend that—

(5) Divorce should be allowed for Habitual Drunkenness, Incurable Insanity, and a commuted Death Sentence, as recommended by the Commission.

Nullity.

The present grounds for annulling a marriage are (1) Impotence, (2) Insanity at the time of marriage, (3) Irregular marriage (*i.e.* parties under statutory age, or within prohibited degrees of consanguinity, or mistake as to the nature of the ceremony, or legal defect in the celebration), and (4) Bigamy, *i.e.* if either party was married at the time of the marriage. The Royal Commission recommended the following additional grounds: (1) Unsoundness of mind appearing within six months of the marriage, and not known to the other party, provided that the suit is brought within a year of marriage, and there has been no marital intercourse after discovery, (2) Concealed Epilepsy, or liability to recurrent insanity, (3) Venereal Disease not disclosed, with reservations similar as for insanity, (4) Pregnancy at the time of the marriage not known, and (5) Wilful and unreasonable refusal of intercourse. We should strongly resent any attempt to achieve by nullity what should be done by divorce. Once divorce for desertion becomes law, the temptation to bring collusive suits for nullity would be largely removed.

We recommend that—

(6) The recommendations of the Commissioners as to extending the grounds for nullity should be carried out.

The Commissioners recommend that the Court should be empowered to presume death after seven years' silence and absence. This is common justice and would relieve especially hard cases.

We recommend that—

(7) The recommendations of the Commissioners as to the presumption of death should be carried out.

The Clergy.

Since 1857 a clergyman may refuse to 'solemnize the marriage of any person whose former marriage may have been dissolved on the ground of his or her adultery.' Technically, therefore, he is bound to remarry the 'innocent' party, though he could only be compelled to at the cost of litigation, but he has to allow the use of the Parish Church if a clergyman can be found who will remarry either an 'innocent' or 'guilty' party. We think that change is necessary here to avoid any possible conflict between Church and State. We are agreed that the State has no right to insist that such re-marriages should take place in Church. Having regard to the way in which divorce cases are heard in Court it is impossible for the Church to accept the dictum of the Court as to the innocence or guilt of the parties, therefore the Church should be allowed to adhere to its own standards of Christian conduct.

We recommend that—

(9) Parliament should relieve the clergy from any obligation to remarry divorced persons, or to allow the use of their Parish Churches

to this end. The question of such marriages should, we think, be decided by the individual clergy.

Education.

Many matrimonial difficulties arise from the ignorance of the parties, and we believe that some instruction given before marriage would help to avoid subsequent disaster. In this connection we would draw attention to the recommendation of the Lambeth Conference, 1930, that steps should be taken to ensure right methods of approach and lines of instruction for those about to marry.

Conclusion.

In conclusion we would express our conviction that, if the proposals here made became law, the moral condition of the country would be greatly improved. The marriage tie would be strengthened, reckless marriages would be discouraged, and many present abuses would disappear. Adultery would play a less prominent part in social life, in fiction, and the drama. There would be less danger that the low standards of those who have chiefly resorted hitherto to the Divorce Court would percolate through the community. Divorce would not be easy but it would be available in all reasonable cases. These reforms which we advocate would bring society nearer to the Christian standard of marriage would become, what it should be, one of the most serious steps in life, and happiness would be available to those who have been crushed by the severity of our present system of law.

We believe that this document constitutes a responsible well-informed and judicious effort, not to facilitate divorce, but to purge our present matrimonial system from certain detrimental and glaring abuses, and to promote the Christian ideal of marriage. The Christian ideal of marriage is that it should be monogamus and indissoluble, and we believe that the reforms suggested in this report will promote this ideal. Churchmen need to be reminded that whilst our Lord proclaimed the ideal of indissoluble monogamy, yet the Christian Church in New Testament times felt it necessary to authorize divorce for (1) matrimonial infidelity and (2) the desertion of a Christian spouse by a pagan spouse.

The question to be asked and answered in connection with any proposed alteration in our marriage laws, is whether such alteration will promote the Christian ideal of marriage. This social experience has taught us, is not best secured in all cases by literal obedience to a principle of Christ as though that principle were a legal precept, but by the application of the whole body of Christian principles to the complexities of an ever-changing situation with the definite purpose of advancing in practice to the Christian ideal.

THE 'EVOLUTION' OF BIBLICAL RELIGION

STANLEY A. COOK, Litt.D., F.B.A., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge.

THE modern way of viewing Old Testament religion along evolutionary lines has become so firmly established that one who has once discovered how it has enabled him to derstand the religious history of Israel will want or, indeed, able to return to any earlier outlook. This evolutionary approach is the offspring of an age rather than of any philosophical other school. It can be traced back to such pre-Darwinians Reuss and the Hegelian Vatke (1833-35); but modern Old estament criticism regards as its founders Kuenen (1869-70), ellhausen (1878) and Robertson Smith (1881), none of whom uld be called Hegelians or Darwinians. More recently, however, the theory of 'evolution' has been reconsidered. Mendel-n, the Great War and the collapse of the belief in a continuous vance, and new developments in Biblical research, have combined to threaten the 'moderate critical' way of treating the history and religion of Israel.[1] It is, of course, agreed by all Old estament scholars that there has been some sort of religious velopment, and even extremely conservative attitudes, including some found among Roman Catholics, are no longer what y once were.[2] But the problem of 'evolution' has become increasingly urgent, and, stimulated by the October issue of the *odern Churchman* and by a reference to what I am supposed be 'advising' (p. 265), I offer these pages as a preliminary ntribution to the subject.

In fact, I wish to suggest that whether Old Testament olars use such terms as 'development,' or 'evolution,' even

[1] Specially suggestive, also, are F. J. Teggart's *Processes of History* w Haven, 1918) and his earlier *Prolegomena to History: the Relation History to Literature, Philosophy and Science* (1916).

[2] It must be admitted that an attitude so enlightened as that of the late on Friedrich von Hügel is rare among them; see his *Essays and resses*, i, 72 *ff.*

with marks of quotation as in the title to this paper, our task is to frame as adequate a view as possible of the broad outlines of the whole course of Biblical religion. Whether it will deserve to be called an 'evolutionary' one is really a secondary matter. Such have been the unique processes in and behind the Bible—the foundation of our civilization—that we have to examine them without any presupposition that what holds good in the scientist's world may also hold good for us. After all, it is not impossible that a fuller knowledge of the processes in the history of religious thought may prove more suggestive for the understanding of those in the specialist fields of history and science than the converse.

Our notions of Old Testament religion and history generally begin, not with the patriarchs and the descent of Jacob's sons into Egypt, but with the Exodus of the 'children of Israel'—the sons having become tribes and clans—and their conquest of the land of their fathers. On inspection, scholars would be found differing widely as to the value of the book of *Genesis* for our knowledge of pre-Israelite conditions. It is commonly agreed that of those people whom we call Israelites only a section had been in Egypt; consequently the original Mosaic tradition, whatever its content, became, only in course of time, the canonical tradition of all Israelites, whether their ancestors had been in Egypt or not.[3] All sorts of reconstructions have been proposed, and special mention may be made of that of Burney, who was convinced (in 1908) that Baylonian and other 'external' evidence would revolutionize our views of early Israelite religion.[4] He argued that those tribes of Israel who remained behind in Canaan practised a 'Canaanite Yahwism'; while their kinsmen who descended into Egypt and returned, along with North Arabian (Kenite) clans, succeeded, only after a long struggle, in replacing a Yahwism, more in harmony with ordinary Semitic religion, by their own purer faith. Burney thus implied that Old Testamen

[3] Two references will suffice: N. Baynes (*Israel amongst the Nations*, p. 201) writes, 'only a part of the Israelites went down into Egypt'; and W. F. Albright, well known as an archaeologist and Orientalist, says, 'it is now quite certain that a large part, perhaps more than half, of the Hebrew people remained in Palestine, and did not enter Egypt at all' (*The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, p. 148).

[4] *Journal of Theological Studies*, ix, 321-52.

eligion was indebted both to Israelite immigrants from Egypt nd to an earlier pre-Mosaic Palestinian source.

As to the content of Mosaism and the history of the early eriod, there is no agreement whatever among scholars. On the her hand, of the contemporary religious and other conditions and around Canaan or Palestine much is known. There were eities not deficient in admirable traits, and tendencies to heno- neism or monolatry of a monarchical type. The Egyptian izerain was freely recognized as divine, and the phraseology f the Palestinian and other letters (found at el-Amarna), not nly sometimes recalls even late passages of the Old Testament, ut indicates how men could have addressed their native gods. erusalem was already powerful by about 2000 B.C., and its reli- ous *milieu*—Anathoth, Beth-Shemesh, Valley of Hinnom, c.—scarcely derives from Israelite invaders, but reminds us of ie tradition of the half-Amorite, half-Hittite ancestry of this Canaanite' city (*Ezek.* xvi, 2 *f.*). It is a tradition which archae- ogy and the contemporary records confirm and supplement.[5]

Thus, what Palestine could offer the Israelites from Egypt a far more practicable enquiry than the reconstruction of Mosaism from the Old Testament; and although the evidence oes admittedly bring perplexing problems, all of us who study ie history and religion of Israel are bound, sooner or later, to ke it more seriously than we do at present, and to adjust our nceptions of the 'evolution' to the facts. The age round about e fourteenth century B.C.—we may call it the 'Mosaic age'— singularly well illuminated. It is a landmark in history and ligion. The monism of the Egyptian 'heretic' king, Amen- otep IV, Ikhnaton, was, on the most moderate estimate, an traordinary phenomenon, as Breasted has repeatedly urged.[6] ot less remarkable is the presence in and to the north of Syria Indian or Indo-Iranian groups who worshipped Mitra

[5] Jirku (*Journ. of Bibl. Lit.*, 1933, pp. 108 *ff*) finds in the Amarna letters gments of 'Canaanite Psalms.' For the Amarna evidence, I may also fer to my *Religion of Ancient Palestine* (1908), chaps. vi-viii; 'Notes on e Old Canaanite Religion,' *Expositor*, Aug. 1910, pp. 111-127; *Camb. c. Hist.*, ii, 330 *ff.*; and *Ency. Brit.*, 14th ed., article 'Hebrew Religion.'

[6] *The Dawn of Conscience* (1934), pp. 291 *ff.*, 367 *ff.* The late Dr. Hall ote: 'We see in his heresy . . . the highest development of religious eas before the days of the Hebrew prophets' (*Ancient History of the ear East*, p. 300).

(Mithras), Varuna and other deities well known in the Rig-Veda. Here again, Dr. Sydney Cave does not exaggerate when he points out that the great ethical god Varuna was regarded as 'a holy god, omniscient, the punisher of sin,' and that to the Christian reader passages in the hymns to Varuna 'inevitably suggest verses from the Psalms and Job'; the thought 'approximates as rarely elsewhere to the moral sublimity of Hebraism.'[7] No doubt the lofty heights of religious speculative thought in the environs of Palestine—with traces in Palestine itself—may be more than a surprise; but only when one has frankly and discerningly realized the situation in the Mosaic age is one entitled to go on and contrast the sequels—the decline of Egypt, the tragic fall of Varuna, and the continuity of Palestine.[8]

Only in Palestine can there be traced a progessive religious development: for example, the ideas of 'sanctity' or 'holiness' (in the goddess Kadesh) and of 'righteousness,' which were non-Israelite and pre-Israelite, received their distinctively ethical and spiritual stamp in the days of the prophets of Israel. The soil of Palestine—as its archaeology also suggests—had some character and structure of its own even in pre-Israelite times and independently of Israelites entering from outside. In fact it is being increasingly recognized that the religion of Yahweh must have been far more Canaanite than ever imagined.[9] Yahwism, one might almost say, was, apart from its name, a Canaanite religion which was profoundly spiritualized and ethicized and owed its permanent value both to the prophets and to influences—rather Puritanical, if not fanatical—from the desert. Some such conclusion as this—the best formula may not yet have been found—is being forced upon us by the fruits of 'Archaeology and the Monuments.'

[7] *Redemption Hindu and Christian* (1919), p. 26. The exalted conceptions of Varuna have even led to the conjecture—an untenable one, as G. F. Moore observes—that the religion of this god was adopted from a Semitic people (*History of Religions*, i, 250 *f.*).

[8] The cult of Varuna was replaced in India by that of the more nationalistic Indra; but the later Iranian Ahura-Mazda carries on the old religious and ethical idealism.

[9] *cf.* Dussaud, *Les Origines Cananéennes du Sacrifice Israélite* (1921), pp. 66-70; Eissfeldt, *Theologische Blätter*, Oct., 1934, col. 280; and Baudissin, *Kyrios* (1909), vol. iii, the most important work since Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites*.

But archaeology and the monuments, while seeming to favour neo-conservatism, have not made it easier to trace the early story of Israel. Not until the days of the great creative prophets is there any definitive reforming movement, and it is such that the religious conditions of the preceding centuries before and after Moses can hardly be recovered from our sources. If the reader will consider carefully the conditions implied in the measures ascribed to Josiah (II *Kings*, xxiii), and in the allusions of Jeremiah and Ezekiel to the contemporary idolatry, he will have some notion of the task that confronts Old Testament scholars.[10] But let him pass on to the sixth century, the Exile, the Second Isaiah and the 'Servant Songs.' He will find himself breathing another air. The lofty convictions in *Is.* xl-lxvi are familiar to all: Yahweh's thoughts transcend man's (lv, 8 *f.*); heaven is his throne and earth his footstool (lxvi, 1). And this wonderful God of the Universe is Israel's own God — the relationship is vital; and is raising up His own people. We are in the midst of real history. We have left behind us the blank scepticism and indifference of Zephaniah's day (i, 12), and the despair as the ruin of Jerusalem draws near. The Second Isaiah, commonly regarded as the height of Hebrew prophecy, the culmination of Israelite religion, comes between the fall of the monarchies and the new reorganization as described in the books of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*.

This new emphasis upon the transcendence of Israel's God enables us to understand the post-exilic age and the priests' insistence upon His supreme holiness. It is the new consciousness of His nearness (*cf.* Ezekiel's vision, xlviii, 35) which so naturally explains the profounder sense of sin, the elaborate sacrificial system, and the intervening wall of Levites, even as the new relationship, more on the lines of Jeremiah (xxxi, 33 *f.*) than of Ezekiel, deepens individual piety as we find it in the *Psalms*. Thus a new era is opened up. The Reformers, as is usual, 'dig themselves in,' and, in due course, we notice what strikes us as a

[10] Note the persistence of the cult of the Queen of Heaven (*Jer.* xliv, 19) and of human sacrifice. The agricultural rites would naturally be more Canaanite than Israelite, and Powis Smith (*The Prophets and their Times*, 1925, p. 61), commenting on Hosea, observes that even in the eighth century B.C. Northern Israel had not yet come to think of Yahweh as the God of the soil and its products.

decline. There is the old egotism, though in a new context (*Is.* lx); and, archaeologically speaking, the nationalistic Yahweh of *Is.* lxiii reminds one of the old storm and war-god Hadad, and the aged god of Daniel's vision (vii, 9) recalls the elderly gods of Beth-Shan and elsewhere. The Temple still has a sort of 'magical' significance (*Zech.* xiv, 17, etc.); and, in general, the post-exilic religion presents many strange features which help one to imagine what the old cultus could have been in pre-exilic and pre-prophetic days.

As the centuries pass we come to the 'Wisdom' Literature, with its humanism and shrewdness; it is instructive to contrast, for example, the words of the sage on the risks of adultery (*Prov.* vi, 32 *ff.*) with the anguish of the Psalmist (*Ps.* li, 4). Descending further, we find ourselves on the threshold of Christianity. It is a fairly continuous and intelligible narrative from the fall of the kingship, down through the prominence of high-priests and Hasmonaeans, to the appearance of the Messiah. After the new Yahwism of the Second Isaiah and the 'Servant,' the facts of spiritual decline and of adjustment or compromise are the stuff that religious history is made of. Nor is it without a parallel when the next wave of religious creativeness carries on, not so much the religious thought of contemporary Jews in Palestine or Alexandria — indebted though it is to both — but rather enhances the spiritual wealth of that mysterious movement which in the sixth century had given new life to Israel. The line from Israel's rediscovery and restatement of her God to the doctrine of the Messiah, the Son of God, is of such unique significance that our conception of the inner history of Biblical religion, as a whole, must be based upon a thorough understanding of the vicissitudes.

Now, when we attempt to go back before the sixth century B.C. or the prophets our most serious difficulties begin. Mosaism and the introduction of Yahweh by Israelite invaders would undoubtedly be a new religious and ethical movement; and consequently it is instructive to observe the downfall of the ethical god Varuna in India and the destruction of Ikhnaton's monistic cult in Egypt. But Biblical history has been written to emphasize Israel's separateness from the Canaanites, and Judah's separateness from (North) Israel; and we have to allow for what

ecent Roman Catholic scholar calls the *Lehrbuchcharakter* of Old Testament.[11] Moreover, it is 'orthodox' criticism that —J on 'evolutionary' grounds is earlier than E[12]—is anterior D in its present form; but while scholars usually begin by rying back the contents of JE to as early a date as possible, literary-critical theory of J, E, D, P really implies that it is w in the form in which the post-exilic editors left it.[13] This is ound method, already applied by S. R. Driver to the *Psalms* by G. B. Gray to *Isaiah*.[14]

It is necessary to remember that the Wellhausen *literary* theory J, E, D, P is not to be confused with the reconstructions of history and religion based thereon by Wellhausen himself or others. me are conservative, others radical, and others again are by means 'evolutionary.' In fact, the weakness of the ordinary volutionary' views of the religion has become ever more clearly nifested as external evidence accumulated.[15] After all, who lizes that our current conceptions of J, E, D, P ignore North ael after about 721 B.C., pass over the Second Isaiah, and rely on the books of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, which are part of the ronicler's' work which, where it can be tested by comparison h the books of *Kings*, is relatively untrustworthy? Whether Old Testament is viewed through conservative or through oderate critical' spectacles, behind it are the gravest historical nges and discontinuities — the passage from Canaanite or -Israelite to Israelite religion, the sweeping events in the enth to fifth centuries B.C., and, ultimately, the transition from 'Israel of the flesh' (a mixed Judah that claimed to be the

[11] Riessler, cited by his pupil, T. F. Stier, *Gott und sein Engel im Alten* (1934), p. 158.

[12] Some dissentient voices place E before J.

[13] For this now post-exilic JE, *cf. Journ. of Theol. Stud.*, xii (1911), p. Joh. Pedersen, the author of *Israel*, a brilliant study of Hebrew tality, is of a similar opinion (*Zeit. f. Alttest. Wiss.*, 1931, p. 178).

[14] Driver, *Lit. of the O.T.*, p. 386; G. B. Gray, *Isaiah*, pp. xxxii, 227. ir emphatic statement of their principles should be carefully read.

[15] I am afraid I do not recognize myself with Fr. Delitzsch and the rs with whom Dr. Lofthouse mentions me (*Modern Churchman*, p. 265); ay refer to my criticism of some of them in the *Cambridge Biblical ys* (1909), pp. 70*ff*. Far more impressive was Winckler's forceful gh rather too polemical pamphlet, *Religionsgeschichtler und geschicht- r Orient* (*Leipzig*, 1906).

true Israel) to an 'Israel of the spirit.'[16] Indeed, we may say that when we consider the profoundly significant 'Israel idea'—which Christendom inherited and developed—there is a sense in which 'Israel' was throughout an 'idea' rather than a continuous, stable, national stock. What will be the future of this 'Israel'?

Any development or evolution which impresses us will be more accurately apprehended if we go below the surface and perceive the actual historical circumstances underlying it. So we may look back to 'Dark' or 'Middle' Ages, and to Greece and Rome, and the Bible; but our retrospect becomes more helpful when we realize that our Western civilization is really a very young one, and that it is an adolescent and acutely self-conscious age that is now scrutinizing the heritage handed down from the past. We must be realists, and must remember that where our ordinary views of the Bible usually refer to a *book*, we have really to do with the literature of a *people*, in a land part of the area of whose history we know far more than was suspected by Wellhausen and other founders of modern critical orthodoxy. To-day we are placing the Bible in the midst of world-history and world-religion, and at the same time world-wide problems of current history and religion are both urgent and disquieting. The evolutionary view of J, E, D, P leaves off in the middle, and even if our view of the Old Testament comprises the New Testament as the culmination of the Old, it runs the risk of stopping there, 1900 years ago, and remaining out of touch with real history. Organic evolution may have ceased with Man, as many years ago as scientists determine; but any 'evolutionary' theory wherein Religion and the relation between God and Man are concerned, must not be indifferent to those processes in the very midst of which we are living. An evolutionary view that is to be of any use to-day must cover the whole Bible, and it must go from the Bible of the past to the interpretation of it to-day; it must be a view of the past that has a meaning for our future.

Old Testament criticism cannot stop at a Maccabaean Daniel or sever Hebrew prophecy and apocalyptic from the New Testament. In a sense, the New Testament is the *dénouement* of the

[16] Whatever be thought of Kennett's theories of the eighth and following centuries B.C., he does not stand alone; see *Church of Israel*, pp. xlv, note 2, xlvii, note 2.

l Yahwism, and its last book the last chapter of Hebrew reli-
n.[17] Like the Second Isaiah, the New Testment is the cul-
nation of one series of stages and the inauguration of another.
oreover, we can look back upon the Mosaic age with its Egyp-
n and Indo-Iranian movements; upon the Second Isaiah, the
(broadly) of Zoroaster, Buddha, Lao-Tse, and others; and
on the rise of Christianity with the contemporary Stoicism and
agavad-gita. In brief, the whole development which Chris-
is value for its uniqueness was part of a far-reaching series of
ges, so that it were a dangerously narrow interpretation that
ored the total environment in which our religion has grown
and now finds itself.

Coming from the Palestine of the Old Testament to that of
New, one receives an impression that will seem strange to the
ologian. Something is now known of the deities of the Near
st in Old Testament times: deities old and young, deities
o are fathers, brothers or sons; kings who stand in an imme-
te relationship with their god or who have an intermediary
l or goddess; kings subordinate to their god, but yet at times
dly distinguishable. Descending a few centuries, we do not
l that the world of Palestine of the New Testament age is an
irely new one. Archaeology and mythology testify to the per-
ence of many ancient features, though in a new dress. We
erve the prominence of Baal, and Hadad, and Mithras—
already known about 1400 B.C. There are solar cults and
dencies to solar monotheism; solar gods and emperor cults;
thful gods and gods of an Apolline type are especially note-
thy; and the nature of the various deities and the relations
veen them imply a rich and complicated mythology.[18]

The deities, too, as in the past, are not without some attrac-
features; they are 'answering,' 'compassionate,' and 're-
ding': Jewish influence need not be suspected.[19] It is in-

[17] The *History of Israel* by W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson and *Hebrew Religion* both go down into the first century A.D. and the beginnings of Rabbinical Judaism.

[18] Some material will be found in my *Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology*, chap. iii. Quite recently it has been shown that the Phœnician cosmology of the Hellenistic age goes back, in part, to the fourteenth century B.C. (in the Ras Shamra tablets from North Syria).

[19] Or at least the Jews were unorthodox; *cf.* C. Moss, *Quart. Stat. of Palest. Explor. Fund*, 1928, p. 103.

teresting to find a Marna(s), 'Our Lord,' and a deity Phaneba 'Face (or Presence) of Baal'; the latter recalls the fact th while it is the title of the goddess Tanit among the Phoenician Judaism had always to fight against tendencies to treat the Nam or the Face (or Presence) of Yahweh, the Shechinah, and th Memra (Word) as personal entities. In brief, we find ourselv in a world which must have provoked speculation — mytholog cal, theological and philosophical — as to the relations betwe the gods and between them and men.[20] To be sure, all this w outside orthodox Judaism, whose monotheism however was f from simple; but when Judaism itself could include men lik Philo and Josephus, it is obvious that the rise of Christiani must be studied in the light of the heterogeneity of belief fro Antioch to Alexandria.

Whether or no Josephus and 'Luke' (*Luke—Acts*), writi for Romans, were ignorant of one another, the former sho how internal anarchy, 'false' prophets, and religious fanatici proved the undoing of the unhappy Jews. On the other han the Christian writers suggest the political innocuousness of t new sect (*Mark* xii, 17) — how naturally the populace prefer Barabbas, a member of the insurrectionary movement wh seemed to offer far better prospects of a release from Rome! It was an age of diverse individualistic tendencies, and 'builde rejected the One who was to become the corner-stone (*Acts* 11; one is reminded of the 'Servant' in *Is.* liii). The extent the movement for which John the Baptist stood is seen, not on in Apollos of Alexandria and the men of Ephesus (*Acts* xviii, 2 xix, 3), but in the prominence so pointedly given to him in *Luk* and *John* i, and in the significant emphasis upon the vital diffe ence between the Baptist's mission and the humblest member the movement which was to supersede him (*Luke* vii, 28). H there been no Jesus there would have been no Christianity; b

[20] On this see, besides note [18] above, the works of Cumont, also Seyrig, *Syria*, x, 340 *ff*.

[21] Josephus throws valuable light upon the Jewish mentality of his d He considers that the disastrous famine was one of the main causes of revolts that led to the fall of Jerusalem (*Ant.* xviii, i, 1). Among ma incidental details of interest is the fact that of three of his acquaintan who were crucified, but on his entreaties taken down, only one recover (*Vita*, p. 75.)

content of the new religion was not derived from its Founder ne—one again thinks of the Servant.[22] The heterogeneity of and thought *before*, and the different nuances *after* (*e.g.* or. i, 12), will seem entirely natural to anyone who traces the tory of new movements; one may even recall the situation in l Testament criticism before and after its chief founders: ergence, convergence, and again tendencies to divergence n a new basis.

The Palestinian Old Testament led to the bifurcation into bbinical Judaism and Christianity; and while the former can dly be said to have carried on the creative spirit of its Sacred ok, the latter was not indebted for its content to the Old stament alone. To the student of religion, the world-wide ognition of a God is overwhelmingly impressive, but even re so is the question of the effectiveness of the content of h God-idea and its ideological setting. Israel owed an in-culable debt to the events behind the Second Isaiah; but they e been blotted out, and the central figure is lost to human owledge—like the reforming movement that produced the derful ethical god Varuna. By harking back to Moses and Abraham, Judaism became an ossified system, a sort of stereo-ed nationalism which, in spite of its many fine theistic and ical elements, had a stagnant conception of God. To this y be due its failure to contribute to the further religious inter-tation of the prophets in the way that Christian interpreters e done who have once *felt* the advance from the Old Testa-nt to the New. But to-day we feel the necessity of a further ance in the synthetic interpretation of the whole Bible itself.

The Jew found his God through the mediation of a divinely-en Law and a divinely-directed history; whereas Christianity ded to break down the old tribal, national, or historical limits which, as criticism shows, were not historically justified. The l Testament prepared the way for Christ; but the Messiah is culmination and sublimation of earlier ideas of divine kings, n-priests, 'son' gods and intermediaries. Christianity is in

[2] I am glad to see that Dr. Lofthouse is one of those who hold that the ant was an individual (above, p. 273 *f.*). But the Servant also connotes lect of Israel, and the problem of the Servant (individual, Israel whole art) and that of Christ (Jesus, the Christian body, the ideal Church) ot be isolated one from the other.

the line of old primitive religion when it takes the conception of a Person and then spiritualizes it. But when Christ is ultimately to hand the sovereignty over to God (I *Cor.* xv, 24), St. Paul, as Edward Caird once said, looks to the end 'in a way that almost carries him beyond Christianity.'[23] To St. Paul, the Jew, God was first and last and above all things; Christian experience was the road to a fuller experience of God, and the Apostle did not feel that the Jew was precluded from reaching it (Rom. x, *f*). One has only to look at the efforts made in the world's religions and notably in the Palestinian area of the first century A.D., to realize that Christianity was the first successful effort to solve the fundamental problem wherever there are religious experience differing in quality, content and ideological environment. But Christianity must not repeat the mistake of the Judaism of the first century A.D. The God of Israel was not Israel's alone (Is. lxv, 1), nor the Son of God for those alone who used His name (*Matt.* vii, 21 *ff*). Consequently our religion, and the interpretation of the Bible upon which it is based, cannot ignore the religious conditions in other lands where 'men feel the presence of His Spirit even though they do not call upon His name.'[24]

It is time to bring this sketch to a close. I am urging that our knowledge of the Mosaic age, quite apart from the internal criticism of the Old Testament, compels a fresh reconsideration of our ideas of the development or evolution of the religion of Israel. Whatever be the best 'reconstruction' of the history and religion of the centuries that follow, the great events of the sixth century B.C. and the Second Isaiah force us to co-ordinate our views of the earlier period with the age that extends to the first century A.D. and the rise of Christianity. We have to take a wider survey of the environment of Biblical religion from beginning to end, and to give heed both to the religious condition when Christianity began to dawn and to all that contributed to its content. The Bible is our first source for understanding certain great forward steps in the past: the successful reconstruction of Israel in and about the sixth century B.C. and the fresh advance a few centuries later, when Christianity, it can be said

[23] *Hibbert Journal,* ii, 18.

[24] From the University Sermon preached by the Lord Bishop of Birmingham at Cambridge, 14 October, 1934.

tinued the curve of development and Judaism flew off at a gent. The more adequately we can understand the course of tory, the more adequate will be our conception of the develop- nt or evolution of religion in, behind and outside the Bible. t we cannot isolate our research from the needs of our age. e live at a time which, once again, seems to be the culmination the past and a prelude to a new future. Those who come er us will assuredly have a far better conception of progres- e development than we who are making the road along which y will look back. And to see the sort of task that lies before , the sort of questions that have to be asked, and to descry, wever dimly, the road to take — all this shows that Progress, gress in the restatement of the relations between Man, God His universe, is something real.

Ancient history becomes ultimately of purely antiquarian nificance unless Biblical history forms an integral part of it; the Bible runs the risk of being merely an object of super- ous veneration unless it is reinterpreted as part of a history ch reaches to our own age. The vicissitudes of Christianity e turned upon the interpretation of the Bible; and the Bible lf may be said to turn upon the two periods in the past when t steps were taken. At the rise of Christianity, what could e seemed more inspiring for the world than the noble ethical notheism of Judaism! But it was not in touch with the growth onsciousness and the movement of thought — and therein is arning for us to-day. And if the vigour, confidence and in- endence of the new sect must have distressed the devout sons srael, in like manner, some centuries earlier, men must have shocked when a prophet like Jeremiah was pointing the to what was to be a new and permanent advance.

At such times ordinary remedies are unavailing (*cf. Jer.* 11); but the cataclysmic expectations, at both periods, did bear the fruit that did the internal spiritual renewals. At such s men must know that they may no longer speak or think ildren, or do after the things they then do (*Deut.* xii, 8); the of ignorance are past (*Acts* xvii, 30), and a higher type of teousness is imperative. The individual must know his re- isibility for his 'talents': there is a Law, but it is near at ; a yoke, but it is light (*Deut.* xxx, 11-14; *Matt.* xi, 30). So

to-day the 'Word of God' may be as much a fetish as was the 'Temple of the Lord' in the days of the prophet (*Jer.* vii, 3 *ff.*); a people may be looking back on the past and not forward to the God waiting to reveal Himself (*Jer.* xxiii, 7 *f.*). And though in difficult times men may feel themselves in exile and away from all symbols of Religion, God reveals Himself in men's hearts, and the permanent essentials of Religion are found *there* and not within the man-made institutions which need renewal (*Jer.* xxix). Biblical history is thus of more than ordinary 'religious' importance; and the Renaissance and Reformation will not have borne their fruits until modern research has placed Biblical history and religion within the framework of our increasing knowledge of our Universe.

THE DIVINE CREATIVE METHOD*

'In him was life and the life was the light of men.'—*St. John* i, 4.

WHEN I was an undergraduate the tradition still linger that Greek and Latin were essential elements in cul ture. The influence of the great thinkers of Greco-Ron civilisation governed the approach to the New Testament; a in consequence, the Christian religion was associated with w was best worth preserving in the greatest of past civilisatio The direction of study and of attention has shifted. The triump of scientific research are now of profound interest to us all. T universe in which we find ourselves has become wonderfull different from that in which our grandparents believed. Th view of the extent and development of the universe and of t past of this earth which is the result of scientific enquiry is no accepted by all but ecclesiastical cranks. The leaders of scie tific research, however limited their general culture may be, a world-famous. And rightly so. They, and men like them, ha created the new understanding of man's place in the univer and, in addition, they have proved themselves benefactors, co tributors to our well-being such as man has rarely known.

* Sermon preached by the Right Rev. E. W. Barnes, D.D., Sc.D F.R.S., Lord Bishop of Birmingham, in Great St. Mary's Church, on Su day, October 14th, 1934.

Pure science is at the basis of the applied science which in has made possible countless inventions and discoveries. se, especially in the last half-century, have profoundly im- ved the conditions of human life. The theory of the electro- netic field, for example, which Maxwell derived from his nematical analysis, stimulated the experimental enquiries of tz and led directly by a chain of ingenious inventions to the less which to-day gives pleasure in millions of homes. The wledge of the properties of material things to which science ed has been employed on a vast scale in organised industry : is added enormously to man's enjoyment of life. Human lgery, the curse of Adam according to the old Biblical story, been almost ended in our generation — a generation which seen the invention of machines capable of performing most ie burdensome tasks of civilisation. So rapid has been the ess of change that millions of men have nothing to do, in of the fact that in all but the poorest homes there are goods mforts and conveniences — which a century ago even the thy did not enjoy. Because of such triumphs of applied ice and because the various aspects of scientific theory are an intellectual achievement of the first order, we rightly give reat men of science the esteem which leaders of progress rve. Furthermore, since the great groups of studies to which efer when we speak of science are of paramount importance e material and intellectual aspects of human culture, the ods and assumptions of science naturally exercise at the nt time widespread influence upon human thought. In par- ur, the influence of science alike upon philosophy and upon ion is far-reaching.

The primary assumption of scientific method is, I suppose, niformity of Nature. The material world is assumed to be e character of a regularly-acting machine. The working of machine can be altered, as it appears, by the action — the ious endeavour — of living animals : but, unless they are nt, uniformity of behaviour can be confidently expected. e men of science would affirm that spontaneity exists g ultimate particles : others, equally eminent, would say any such appearance of free activity is an illusion due to norance of the conditions under which it occurs. All would

agree that statistical averages lead to uniformity in all phenomena which can be directly perceived by the senses. Breaches of the so-called laws of Nature do not occur. Now, the man of science, as such, makes no metaphysical assumptions. He may, or may not, believe that the laws of Nature are laws of God, Creator and Ruler of all. But, if he be a theist, he never finds God intervening to modify His laws. Of the existence of Nature's miracles — Divine violations of the physical order — he can find no trace. Those of us who believe in God do so because we think that we find a unity of purpose and plan in the Universe. We do not believe that the chance development of the primary particles of physics could have led to the world, including ourselves, as we know it. We find evidences of the constructive activity of Mind. We also think that the scheme of things would not to so great an extent be capable of explanation in terms which we find reasonable were it not that our minds are akin to the Mind of its Creator. In such wise are we led to believe that the Universe expresses the thought and will of God, Whom we do not wholly misrepresent as we fashion Him in our own likeness. But observation shows that God does not need to interfere with the working of the machine which He has made. Thus, the man of science is concerned with a natural world where, in Christian language, God's action is uniform. He knows nothing of supernatural interventions by which God is supposed to show His power.

In thus repudiating the supernatural he does not, of course, repudiate the spiritual. All the higher thoughts and emotions of men belong to the realm of things spiritual. But the material and the spiritual alike belong to the natural order. Man is a product of Nature's processes. His mind is the result of a slow evolutionary process from primitive beginnings which may possibly be placed a thousand million years ago. I personally believe that the mind of man has so specially developed that we can, albeit most imperfectly, understand the purpose of creation and the character of the Creator; there is thus some community of nature between God and man. But however high may be the claims that we make for man's spiritual capacity we do well to abandon the idea that there is a realm of super-nature where God is revealed by special physical occurrences. If there be

d — as I believe — then the whole realm of things created is s realm. He can be seen, by the man who has eyes to see, erywhere. The uniformity of Nature reveals His unchanging ler. In those reactions between ourselves and the material rld which we term sacramental, in that they deepen and engthen our spiritual understanding, there are revelations of d. And in conscience, with its emphasis on righteousness and th, God speaks, as it were, directly. In ascribing speech to d, I am, of course, using a metaphor. We know practically hing of that direct action of mind upon mind which shows lf as herd-instinct and is the cause of mental infection; and operation of the Divine mind upon the human is utterly cure. But I myself have no doubt that God reveals Himself hose who wait upon Him. Were this feeling not both general l with some basis in truth the habit of prayer might be ex- ted to cease. In such a matter, of course, a man can only ak at first hand from his own personal experience and he must w that he may have been mistaken. But when the experience vide groups of men seems to confirm the conclusions of the ividual his belief ceases to be irrational. Thus I accept what may call 'psychological' miracles: mind-states exist which eal the active presence of God among men. But on the other d adequate evidence for the existence of material miracles reaches of so-called laws of Nature — is not forthcoming. may grant that God *can* work such miracles: the evidence He does so is lacking.

Belief that God does not interfere with the uniformities of ure which express His will is comparatively modern. It has vn strong as the triumphs of scientific method have spread. ur own generation it has at length become almost axiomatic. urally, it has profoundly influenced religious belief. A eration ago men had begun to approach the Old Testament the assumption that the Nature-miracles recorded therein not objective facts. But only in our own time has it come t that in the approach to the Gospels the same assumption ade. In consequence the value of the Gospels as history is usted and many teachers — especially in the elementary ols of the country — are reluctant to teach the Christian . Thus a situation has arisen which, though too commonly

avoided by leaders of religious thought, is of fundamental importance.

I myself feel that the argument against material miracles has become so strong that, whatever our private convictions, we had better not attempt to overthrow it. Let us grant that in the Gospels we have the results of popular preaching and popular myth-making: that the records are not history in the modern sense but in part results of imaginative meditation and religious enthusiasm. Do we thereby lose much worth keeping? When I was a young man I should have thought that the loss was great, almost overwhelming. As Hort said half-a-century ago, the appeal to credentials has always found favour because it seems so simple and effective. If we could point to external signs of supernatural power and knowledge in Christ and the apostles, it was only necessary when any particular doctrine was assailed to show that it came from those who had such knowledge. Men eagerly seek for simple exits from difficult situations. But is such simple apologetic, when closely examined, as satisfactory as it seems at first sight? In those notes appended to his Hulsean Lectures which contain some of the most pregnant ideas of modern theology, Hort rightly enquired: 'Supposing the supernatural power and knowledge proved, what do they prove beyond themselves?'

Meditation upon this enquiry has made me indifferent to the credentials termed miraculous. The fact is that the Christian faith must rest upon its appeal to the heart and mind of man. We believe Jesus to have been divine not because of His Virgin Birth — such births are common enough in the insect world — but because in Himself and in His teaching He seems to us to reveal God. There was a something in His spirit or personality which showed through His conflict with limitations which were His and are also ours; and this something is alike a source of wonder and an inspiration to us. If there is, as I have previously suggested, some ground of union between God and man, then such a Divine indwelling as I believe we find in Jesus is not inconceivable. God could only save men by giving them a love of righteousness and truth, a desire for beauty and peace. Do not such desires come to the follower of Jesus? Are we then wrong in speaking of Him as Saviour?

Some who have the not uncommon feeling that true mysti-
m must be beyond understanding will say that I am rational-
ng away the Christ of the Church's faith. It is not so. When
recognize in Jesus alike a Divine indwelling and a saving
wer we are preserving essentials. And, moreover, we em-
atically preserve the distinctly Christian doctrine of God
en we assert that the Man in Whom the Creator was revealed
came poor, set Himself to help those in need, knelt to wash
n's feet and was put to death by foes made by those passions
jealousy, greed and fear which bid fair to destroy us all.

Grant that the miracle-working Christ, whose earthly life
s bounded by the Virgin Birth and the Empty Tomb, was
epted by the second generation of Christians — did they
ue nothing else in the Gospel message? I would confidently
ert that what they valued supremely were the inspiration to
nteousness which came through Christ and the revelation of
d's loving care which they believed that they found in Him.
hild likes marvels, the gorgeous magic of imaginary super-
ural power; the grown man sets aside such fancies and seeks
ritual reality. And if we to-day are at a stage of growth when
too are beginning to disentangle spiritual reality from the
hs which probably helped to preserve it, need we be troubled
our deepened understanding?

Christ lives: it is well-nigh impossible to go to a meeting
he League of Nations Union and not feel His presence.
ist lives in our social legislation, in the best of our hospitals,
ne men and women who up and down our land are as light
ing in darkness. He lives and, moreover, He is extending
sway. The world over — and especially in the great civilisa-
s of Eastern Asia — men feel the presence of His Spirit
n though they do not call upon His name. What does it
ter if old creeds and dogmas and forms of worship dissolve
he influence of Christ increases? New symbols will be
ned: new types of worship will help to bring men near to
. The old can be discarded like a worn garment: we lose
ing if the life that was in Jesus continues to be the light of
.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE UNIVERSITIES

By the Rev. E. C. Ratcliff, M.A., Fellow and Chaplain of the Queen's College, Oxford, sometime Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

NOT the least interesting feature of the sermons preached before the University of Cambridge is the so-called Bidding Prayer which introduces them. In a slight compass of less than fifty lines, it presents us with a mental panorama of our national life as seen *sub specie religionis*. In a manner peculiar to itself, and with emphasis proper to its purpose, it epitomizes English history and sums up the English tradition. In particular it reflects an attitude of mind characteristic of the English people —that attitude, I mean, which sees no antinomy between the sacred and the secular, the civil and the ecclesiastical, but which while recognizing the diversity of their functions, discerns between them a community of purpose. With this attitude of mind as by a moving principle, the English tradition is instinct; and cannot be doubted that the refusal to separate religion and the work of the Church from the realm of what is often called 'the secular' has been responsible, in the past at all events, for the seriousness and sanity of English public and private life.

It may be supposed by some that the explicit mention, in the Bidding Prayer, of the Bishop of the Diocese of Ely is to be accounted for by the attitude to which I have made reference. In part this is doubtless true; but it is possibly not the only explanation. The case is not clear; because the Cambridge Bidding Prayer, unlike the form in use in Oxford, is not based upon the 55th canon of 1604, but apparently is a local usage, the beginnings and growth of which are obscure. In any case, however, the mention of the Bishop of the Diocese recalls certain passages in the history of this University, and we shall not be too imaginative perhaps if we take the reference to him as a courteous and friendly close to a sharp contention. The passages in question form an important chapter not in the history of the

iversity of Cambridge only, but as well of that of English cation generally. They have contributed also, though in- ctly rather than directly, to the formation of the English ital outlook which I have described.

The beginnings of this University, it is well known, are sur- nded by obscurity. In the matter of its origins, Cambridge, to be feared, even more than Oxford, has been guilty of a uresque unveracity which conceals not a particle of truth. ere is an apparent probability in Oxford's ascription of its innings to Alfred the Great; but not the simplest faith of most imaginative tourist would be prevailed upon to accept story of Cantaber, or alternatively of King Arthur and his rter of Foundation dated 531 A.D. Such data as we possess, s Mullinger in his great *History*, point to the likelihood that University of Cambridge took its rise from the conventual rch at Ely. Rashdall rejects this view. Nevertheless, it is ond dispute that when the University emerges into the clear t of day, it is in close relationship with and dependence upon See of Ely. Members of the University were subject to the nary ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Bishops of Ely; and Bishops or their Officials moderated in University disputes. night have been hoped in 1318 that the University had eved its independence; for in that year a Bull of Pope John II exempted it from the spiritual and ecclesiastical powers he Bishops of Ely and the Archbishops of Canterbury, and ed those powers in the Chancellor of the University. The ops of Ely, however, seem to have ignored the Bull, and success; for as late as 1374 we find the Chancellor of the versity compelled, on an appeal to the Court of Arches, to the oath of canonical obedience to the Bishop of the Dio- . The matter came to a head some sixty years later. In 1430, Chancellor-elect refused to take the oath to the Bishop of , and the latter prosecuted him in the Roman Court. Two s later the case was argued before the Papal delegates sit- in the Priory at Barnwell. The tact and imagination of the iaeval academicians proved equal to the occasion. The deci- of the matter rested with the Papal delegates, and the Uni- ity therefore produced in support of its claim an *argumentum Papam*. The defence of the University was based, as we

should expect, upon privileges granted by previous Popes. But the decisive document was not the Bull of John XXII. It was a fictitious Bull of Pope Honorius I, of which, it was said, the original having been lost for some seventy years, only a copy could be presented. The document in question completely proved the case of the University. Indeed it could not do otherwise; for, whereas the Bull could not have been issued later than 638 A.D., there was no Bishop of Ely until 1109. The University thus had an advantage of seniority over the Diocese by nearly half a millennium; and if anyone was disposed to raise a question concerning this particular Pope's solicitude for the University, his doubt was presumably set at rest by Honorius's own statement that in his early years he himself had been a student at Cambridge. To Cambridge ecclesiastics of the reformed tradition this selection of Honorius as the first patron of the University will seem prophetically apposite, since that Pontiff is now mainly of interest to them on account of a lapse from orthodoxy which constitutes an objection to the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility. However humorous the evidence cited, the formalities of legal procedure were duly observed. Examination of the evidence satisfied the Papal delegates of the justice of the Universitiy's case, and they decided in its favour. Pope Martin ratified their decision. Two years later it was confirmed by Pope Eugenius IV.

If the means by which the exemption was secured were questionable, there was no disputing the competence of the authority which granted it. The University was now free both of the Bishops of Ely and of the Archbishops of Canterbury. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction within the University was exercised by the Chancellor, and ecclesiastical persons who were members of the University performed their functions independently of the will and permission of the Diocesan Bishop. It had become, as it was to remain, an article of academic religion that the Bishop of Ely hath no jurisdiction within this University of Cambridge.

The recognition of the fact of exemption, and the manner of its working, are exhibited in the Cliffe case of 1528. Robert Cliffe, Chancellor to the Bishop of Ely, excommunicated a member of the University for a moral offence committed outside the University boundary. In retort, the Vice-Chancellor excom

unicated Cliffe for infringing University privilege. Cliffe re-sed to give way, and the matter was submitted to Cardinal olsey. Wolsey gave judgment in favour of the Vice-Chancellor. ffe was ordered to make his submission to the Vice-Chancellor on his knees, 'saying that he was sorry that there should be y variance betwixt the University and the B[ishop].' Some ty years later, in the reign of Elizabeth, Bishop Thirleby ote an account of the Cliffe case for the information of Arch-hop Parker. He concluded his narrative with the words, 'And the privileges of the University in their exemptions from the isdiction of the B[ishop] of Ely corroborated and renued.'

The reign of Elizabeth saw the confirmation of yet another lesiastical privilege, of no small importance to the Univer-. In 1503, Pope Alexander VI had empowered the Chancel-to appoint twelve preachers annually to preach throughout gland without being under the necessity of holding a licence m the Ordinary. Queen Elizabeth confirmed this privilege in 1. In 1565 one of the University preachers, George Withers Corpus Christi College, came into conflict with Archbishop ker for preaching in Great St. Mary's Church, Cambridge, in our of destroying superstitious windows. He had already claimed himself a refuser of the square cap. It was not un-ural therefore that Parker should regard him as the subver-champion of a dangerous freedom, and should in conse-nce seek to silence him. Parker found the means to suspend hers, not on the ground that his licence had been illegally ed, but on the ground that it was defective, since it had not n signed by the Chancellor. Earlier in the same year, Queen zabeth had appointed Parker as the proper authority to re-s ecclesiastical disorders, and in her letter of appointment explicitly recognized the independent jurisdiction of both Universities. Fifteen years later, in 1580, we find on record t appears to be the last attempt of a Bishop of Ely to exer-jurisdiction within the University. The Bishop enjoined a lic fast with sermons. The Bishop was a Puritan, and no t expected to win support from the influential Puritan mem-of the University. The University authorities, however, cautious. They doubted whether they could comply with-breaking the law, and referred the matter to Burghley, the

Chancellor. Burghley's answer was as wary as their own statement had been. He did not know, he said, by what authority the Bishop prescribed the fast at this time. As public counsellor of the realm, he could not countenance any procedure which was not established by the laws of the realm or promulgated by a competent ecclesiastical power, 'approbated by the Queen's majesty's authority, as head governor.' If the Bishop's direction, Burghley concludes, falls under either of these headings, 'I wish it should take place.' It is not recorded whether or not the fast was observed. Burghley himself was sympathetic towards Puritanism, and his point against the Puritan Bishop is for that reason of greater force. In effect Burghley states that the Bishop of Ely might send directions to the University of Cambridge, if he had the Queen's commission to do so. In other words, the only ecclesiastical jurisdiction to which the University is subject is that of the Crown. In all other aspects, the University constitutes an independent ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the completeness of which is demonstrated by the possession of an authority, regarded in the early days of the Reformed Church of England as of the essence of jurisdictory power — the authority, namely, of licensing preachers. The University of Oxford constitutes a similar jurisdiction; and the authority, rights and powers of the two ancient Universities in this kindom are recognized both by the Canons of 1604 and by the Act of Uniformity of King Charles II.

This hurried historical resumé will not improbably appear uninteresting and unimportant. Uninteresting it may be; although it may be pleaded that its want in interest is not inherent in the subject, but arises out of a necessarily brief treatment of it. Unimportant, on the other hand, the history is not. For without the events which it records, the University of Cambridge would hardly have acquired its present character, and would have failed, in consequence, to affect English life as profoundly as it has. It would be idle to pretend that the Papal exemption from local ecclesiastical authority granted to Cambridge in the Middle Ages—and granted also to Oxford — was granted out of a desire to foster intellectual freedom. Nothing could be further from the truth. To a Papacy seeking to extend its powers at the expense of king and bishops, Universities attached to its own cause and detached

from theirs promised impregnable support, since it was to the Universities' interest to maintain the Papal power against all others, and the means by which they could do so were such, it was imagined, as to put to silence the Papacy's opponents, if not to command their respect. It is one of the paradoxes of history, however, that institutions designed to accomplish some particular purpose frequently become instruments for defeating it. The English Universities are a case in point. Already in the Middle Ages, Oxford, in its encouragement of Wycliffite teaching, had manifested an independence of thought distasteful to authority, whether episcopal, royal or papal. Nearly a century and a half later Cambridge was to follow a similar course in its encouragement of the doctrines of the Reformation. Papal exemption had in fact secured to both Universities an atmosphere favourable to freedom of mind, and had prepared the way thereby for the destruction, in England, of that system of which the Papacy was the crown. Unbalanced though the earlier manifestations of this freedom may be, they are nevertheless the initial symptoms of that temper of mind in which it is taken for granted all intellectual work should be performed—the temper of mind, that is, which is concerned with the pursuit of truth, and will not suffer the prescribing of conclusions before the undertaking of study.

It is in this connection that the influence of the two ancient Universities upon English life calls for notice. That that influence is universal needs no emphasis. It is exercised by teachers, by books, or by both, wherever the arts and sciences are studied. It is, or perhaps more truly has been, exercised also by the Church of England through a considerable number of its clergy. In the past, before the awakening of the Universities in the nineteenth century, it was mainly exercised by the Church of England, the great majority of whose clergy were drawn from these two Universities. Indeed, it is true to say that the history of theological and religious thought in the Church of England is the history of theological and religious thought at Oxford and Cambridge. The significance of this fact is easy to miss. Theological study at the two ancient Universities has never been pursued in isolation from other studies. The history of University thought in the seventeenth century offers abundant illustration of this. The statement is true likewise of the eighteenth century,

which it is the fashion in certain quarters to regard, mistakenly, as a period of complete intellectual stagnation. It is unnecessary, as it would be invidious, to mention outstanding names which prove this thesis equally true of modern times. As the Theological Faculty has taken its place side by side with the other Faculties of the Universities, so has the study of theology taken its place as the study of an aspect of Reality side by side with the studies which these other Faculties represent. Neither the philosopher nor the historian, to take but two examples, have been able to ignore Theology; and the old conflict between Science and Religion is evidence of a concern which each cannot but entertain towards the other.

We are so accustomed to this state of things, that its meaning and value sometimes escapes us. The inter-connection between theology and other studies in the English Universities has entailed for theology, generally speaking, a progress or at least a movement correlative with that in other fields of study. As a random example, we may recall the advance made last century in all knowledge relating to the Old Testament, and set in motion by the questionings of scientists and historians. Further, the freedom and independence of external authority with which students of other branches of learning have pursued their researches, have applied also to the study of theology in Oxford and Cambridge. The importance of this fact is again illustrated in the field of the Old Testament. The knowledge which has been obtained here by such English scholars as Driver and Ryle and their successors, and which has become a part of our common modern equipment, would have been impossible had an external ecclesiastical authority been able, in the fancied interests of orthodoxy, to impose either a veto upon research or a silence upon its results. In one other respect, and not the least important, has theology benefited from its position as a fellow citizen with other studies in the commonwealth of learning. The 'scientific method' as applied in modern times to all branches of study is applied also to theology. The same rules of evidence, the same canons of criticism, literary, textual and historical, are in operation within the theological area as outside it; and the best modern theological work is no less detached and candid in treatment than any other. When in 1861 Jowett wrote, in *Essays*

and Reviews, 'interpret the Scripture like any other book,' the principle was new, and the opponents of it would have mobilized, had such a course been possible, the forces of ecclesiastical authority to condemn and suppress it. At the present time the underlying principle of Jowett's dictum is accepted in every department of University theological study. Any other treatment of theology than this with which we are familiar doubtless seems unthinkable, but it is not necessarily impossible. In Cambridge the foundations of this freedom were laid in the early struggles of the University against the authority of the Diocesan Bishop.

The effects of University theological study have been no less fortunate and healthy than the conditions under which the study has been pursued. The effects have also been not solely academic in their operation. The close association of theology with other studies and its equal freedom with theirs have led to the adoption of that mental attitude which sees no antithesis beween the religious and the non-religious, the sacred and the secular. The clergyman of the Church of England, educated at Oxford or Cambridge, has manifested this attitude in his parish, and by showing himself interested in and acquainted with learning in general has demonstrated to his parishioners that theology and religion are not a specialized and isolated interest suited only to persons of a particular cast of mind. Furthermore, as his theological reading was not in a subject crystallized and finally fashioned some centuries before, but in one growing in its contacts with contemporary currents of thought and adjusting itself to new knowledge, the Church of England clergyman with a University training has not been at a disadvantage when new knowledge and new ideas have been claimed as destructive of the cause he represents. In short, the theological schools of the two ancient Universities have supplied the Church of England with a clergy who, whatever their defects, have been sensitive to the changes of the psychological climate of their time, who also have not been isolated by their training from the people among whom they have worked, and who for these two reasons have succeeded in maintaining contact between the Christian Religion and the English people. The close association maintained between the Church of England and the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge in the education of the clergy have assisted the

Church, in a marked degree, towards the performance of its proper work.

To-day, there is no longer strife between the two Universities and the local ecclesiastical authorities from whose jurisdiction they are exempted. Friendly relations have existed between them for a matter of centuries. If the clergy of the Universities do not hold licences from the Bishops of Oxford and Ely, they are not lacking in proper respect for the office and persons of the Bishops, and if they preserve the long-standing independence and freedom of thought in their teaching, it is out of no desire to flout or embarrass ecclesiastical authority. The Bishops on their side are free from all suspicion of seeking to abolish ancient liberties or to establish new restrictions. Yet, for all the amity between the Universities and the Bishops, there are signs that all is not well between the Church of England and the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

Some fifty or sixty years ago, the great majority of the clergy received their theological education at one or other of the Universities. The authorities of the Church desired no other arrangement, and in the cases of men who were reading some other subjects, they took steps to ensure a minimum of theological study by such means as the Divinity Testimonium. This is unfortunately no longer true. The last half-century has seen the establishment of a score or more of Theological Colleges, of which about a third are connected with a University, the rest being situated, for the most part, in Cathedral cities. At their inception, the purpose of the Theological Colleges was to provide the pastoral and devotional training which lie outside the scope of the University system. As a conclusion to the theological training of the University, the pastoral and devotional course of the Theological College was of undoubted value. Of recent years, however, the Theological Colleges have been called upon to supply the whole theological education of an increasing number of ordination candidates. It is not the fault of the Theological Colleges; the burden is being placed upon them by the authorities of the Church. The effect of this policy has been the withdrawal of ordination candidates from the Theological Schools of the Universities. It may fairly be questioned whether this course may be described as a policy, as it may not be as de-

liberate as the word 'policy' suggests. It is certainly, however, a marked tendency, and it is encouraged in influential quarters. Every theological tutor in the Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge is accustomed to being informed by the ordination candidates of his College that they do not propose to read theology at the University, but prefer to do so at a Theological College. The reasons advanced in favour of this plan are various. The most common is that some clergyman of official standing who has oversight of the candidate's training advises the plan on the ground that the University theological course is unsatisfactory and inadequate and that the University Theological School is in itself inferior to every other. Such an argument can only be used by those who are unfamiliar with the subject of which they are treating. It is the experience of Oxford theological students of first-class attainments that the mental discipline demanded by the Theological School is as severe as that required by, for example, the Greats School. *Mutatis mutandis* Cambridge can offer similar testimony. If a training in the history, criticism and interpretation of scripture, in the Greek of the New Testament, and in the beginnings and growth of Christian thought, is unsatisfactory and inadequate, it would be interesting to know what the objectors to the course desiderate. Sometimes the objection is made that University theological teaching conforms to no particular ecclesiastical orthodoxy. This objection commends itself only to the few, and it needs no argument to show that it is rather a merit than a defect. Sometimes, again, it is urged that a University theological education has an unsettling effect upon ordination candidates, and that the atmosphere of devotion which they will find in Theological Colleges is alone suitable to a due appreciation of their subject. This objection is perhaps more often felt than expressed. Latent in many clerical and lay religious minds is the fear that too great a knowledge of theology will result in a rejection of religious belief and in a consequent loss of men to the ministry.

The Theological Colleges therefore are undertaking the major part of Church of England theological education at the present day. They perform their work with whole-heartedness, devotion to duty and great ability; but it cannot be contended that they are satisfactory substitues for the Theological Schools

of the Universities. The Theological Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge form a class apart, and do not fall under this condemnation. The Theological College in the small cathedral or country town, however, is by its very situation unfitted to be a centre of intellectual activity. Its members are dependent solely upon the society of each other, and this is not its least serious defect. The student of theology, as much as any other, needs to associate with men of different studies and opposed points of view, while he is actually pursuing his course of reading, if he is to derive the fullest benefit from it. It is not enough that he has read another subject under these conditions at a University before coming to the Theological College. Without the discussions and interchanges of view which form one of the most valuable features of University life, the study of theology is bound to suffer. Moreover, the intellectual atmosphere of a Theological College is not one of freedom. The conclusions are settled in advance. However able the teacher, and however apt the pupil, the study cannot be conducted in genuine detachment. The possibility of the ultimate untruth of the Christian proposition cannot, of necessity, be entertained; and until the theological student has fairly entertained it, his study is incomplete, and is, in proportion, without value. At its best a Theological College is a school of Christian apologetic; at its worst it is no more than a cramming institution for ecclesiastical examinations. The University student who takes its course is submitted to an intellectual discipline far less severe than would be demanded of him in preparation for one of the professions; and the non-University student invariably leaves his Theological College without an adequate appreciation of the range and significance of the subject of his study.

The resulting situation is serious beyond exaggeration. Never before in the history of England was there a greater need of an intellectually able clergy, for never before has the educated class comprised so large a proportion of the population. There is everywhere, particularly in industrial parishes, a new interest in ideas. Often it is uninformed and crude in its manifestation: but those who are affected by it demand ideas and serious argument from any who may disagree with them. Marxian presuppositions are widely assumed by the younger generation; and the

objections to Christianity, which the young Marxians make, are not a formless tirade, but a reasoned attack. They call for a reasoned answer on the part of the clergyman. It is unfortunately true that the devotion of the clergyman, his sincerity and hard work, his generosity and readiness to help all who need help, will not stand him in good stead as an argument against his new opponents. For them, these things are evidence of misguidance. For them also, rightly or wrongly, the clergyman is an expert in Religion, and it is his business to set out the intellectual basis of Religion. Those who conduct the argument may be few; but those who listen are many, and when the clergyman is unequal to the task of defending his position, the listeners may be forgiven if they think that the anti-Christian position alone is intellectually sound. Religion, so Baron von Hügel once said, is ultimately a question of metaphysic. The modern anti-Christian dogmatist has grasped the fact, and it is dimly perceived by the multitude. Unless those who are responsible for the education of the clergy realize it also, and unless they equip the clergyman with a metaphysical training, he will be impotent before the forces pitted against the cause he represents.

The clergyman of to-day is all too often at a disadvantage in the face of the opposition he must encounter. It is not his fault. Isolated at the time of his training for his work, when he most needs to be in touch with the world of thought and men, his mind is moulded in a style comparable to the artificial and unconvincing Gothic of the building in which he must usually minister. His segregation in his Theological College is symbolic of a more fundamental segregation of his personality from the men and women among whom he is called to labour. Their ideas, their objections to himself, their general view of life, are unfamiliar to him. It is little wonder that he confines his activities to the little company of faithful persons who are more or less regular in their attendance at his church. He therefore becomes representative of a specialized activity. His work is performed to the honour of God; but, as far as the non-churchgoer considers these things, it does not appear to be conducive to the welfare of God's people. Religious education divorced from sound learning, as the latter is understood in the Universities, have made him a stranger to the modern world. The separation between the

sacred and the secular, the civil and the ecclesiastical, upon which in self-defence he must insist, make him unwilling to take a part in that fraction of the national life which manifests itself in his parish and town. He therefore stands aside from the stream of the English Tradition; and in so doing, both unwittingly and unintentionally, contributes to the weakening of the influence of the Church whose officer he is.

The remedy for this unhappy situation is indicated by the Bidding Prayer. Religious education must once again be united to sound learning. The theological training of the clergy must be restored to the Universities; and the Theological Colleges should recover their original function of supplying a training in things pertaining to devotion and pastoralia. To-day, the importance of the Universities in national life is greater than at any other period of our history; and for the Church of England to weaken its connection with them is to lose its hold on both the mind and imagination of the English people. It would be well if the authorities of the Church of England would reflect upon the history of their Church, and upon that of the institutions which have exercised a formative power upon their Church. For, if we learn nothing else from that history, in clearest and most decided terms we at least learn this—that the cause of Christianity among the people of England is bound up with the Church of England, and that the secret of the English people's attachment to the English Church is the intimate association of the latter with historic and representative English institutions. In its connection with the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, in the freedom of the theological, as well as of all other study, which those Universities have won, the Church of England possesses the necessary means of training a clergy who, sensitive to English tradition and history, and understanding the English mind, can, in the special doubts and uncertainties of these present times, enable that mind to retain its hold upon religion and the things of the Spirit. The connection between the Church and the Universities is loosened, but it is not yet lost. It should be the concern of the Church not to lose it, for in the day that that connection is lost, the Church of England will have cast down one of the chief, if not the chief, of the mainstays of its influence over the English people.

BOOK REVIEWS

FACING THE FUTURE*

Mr. Tetley in his challenging book pictures the Christian Church as in the midst of one of the most acute crises in its history, a crisis comparable with that through which St. Paul led it successfully when from its existence as a new Jewish sect it was transformed into a world-religion, a crisis no less serious than that which was caused by the collapse of the Roman Empire. It survived its second great crisis with such success that it provided the unifying principle for a new civilization. Since the Renascence, Mr. Tetley holds, the Church has become increasingly alien from the vital thought and activities of the Western world, and this alienation has during recent years become immensely more marked as a result of the political and social upheaval which followed the Great War.

It was not unnatural that in the early Church the doctrine of Original Sin should hold such a central position that the theological atmosphere smelt of brimstone as well as incense, for the Church was face to face with a collapsing civilization, a world gone putrid, a 'pagan world of misery, sorrow and vice.' The existence of a Primaeval Curse, under which mankind was suffering, was a natural deduction from the facts of life, and with it was coupled the consequent need of redemption. There was also need for a theological justification for the practice of the strong ecclesiastical discipline which the chaos of a collapsing civilization demanded. This was supplied by the belief that the organ of redemption was the Catholic Church, whose system of organization and discipline was 'the connecting link between the hopeless, fallen sinner and his hope of gaining Heaven—a hope which was turned into despair if, for any reason, he did anything which brought upon him the wrath or censure of those who held the Keys of Heaven.' Redemption belonged to a life beyond death, while, instead of starting with the New Life in Christ, the Ancient Fathers went back to the third chapter of the Book of Genesis, which 'is really the starting-point of the whole Roman Catholic system.' Mr. Tetley's judgment is that 'the Church forgot the things that are before; it looked behind, like Lot's wife, and it has been looking behind ever since.'

With the Renascence the unecclesiastical mind took to looking forward, and its dominant interest was concerned with this present world. The events chronicled in the third chapter of the Book of Genesis are now known to be mythological. 'The *old* theory of the Fall including the Atonement, hierarchical authority, and the Power of the Keys, instead of being regarded as dogmas founded on absolute and historical facts, are now known to be nothing more authoritative than fantasies and speculations of the human mind, and with this knowledge the real basis of the claim to clerical domination has gone.' Mr. Tetley dwells in some detail on the consequences of the modern historical perspective and the abandonment of the historical framework of the Scheme of Redemption. He does well. There has been far too much theological legerdemain in this matter.

The Church has failed as yet to recognise the extent to which the outlook on life has been changed by the new knowledge. It still clings to its theology of Fall and Redemption, while giving no adequate recognition to

* *Has the Christian Church a Future?* By S. Tetley, M.A., Vicar of Wortley, Leeds. (Williams and Norgate, Ltd. 1934. Price 6/-.)

our knowledge of the extent to which character is made by controllable environment and mind affected by the working of the body. It is here that Bolshevism is strong in its theory, while Behaviourism, in spite of its defects, is right in envisaging a medical and psychological technique which will be successful in moulding character. We are in fact living in a new world, whether brave or otherwise. Roman Catholicism, Mr. Tetley thinks, is inherently unable to adapt itself to the new position, while Protestantism suffers from lack of cohesion and the absence of a clear and generally accepted *Weltanschauung*. At present, he says, the Protestant Churches are carrying out a kind of spring-cleaning, and, during the process, must be content to receive such guests as they can accommodate. 'But ultimately they must demonstrate the relevance of the Christian view of Reality to the demands of living in actual circumstances.' Mr. Tetley has given his book an interrogative title. He ends it on a note of interrogation. 'Can the Church recover its first fine careless rapture in a fresh understanding of its unique message?'

Mr. Tetley obviously has read widely. He is sensitive to the movements of modern thought and is quick to respond to what there is of value in them. His criticism is frequently acute. We may hope that he will follow up this useful book by another, in which he will work out in some detail his conception of a Church of the future which will be organic to the world of actuality.

G. L. H. Harvey.

M. LOISY ON THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL*

Really helpful books dealing with the history of the religion of Israel are rare, and none of them is quite satisfactory. For the Jew, Hebrew religion is so much part and parcel of his ordinary everyday life that it is almost impossible for him to regard it dispassionately. For the Christian it is so much mixed up, as he is accustomed to think, with Christianity that he is seldom able to study it impartially. One is inclined to think that we shall have to wait for a satisfactory treatment of the subject until some well-equipped scholar who is neither Jew nor Christian, but is sympathetic on both sides, undertakes to handle it. M. Alfrey Loisy would no doubt deny that he is not a Christian. Yet he is so far from being an orthodox Christian that he might well be thought to fulfil the requirements for an impartial historian. Nevertheless, the new edition of his book on the religion of Israel, though it is a revision of an earlier work published more than thirty years ago, on the whole follows closely the plan of that work, a plan which envisages the religion of Israel as a preparation for 'la Naissance du Christianisme.' Such a plan, I venture to think, tends to a serious misunderstanding of both Hebraism and Christianity. Hebraism, which by the way owes far more to Egyptian religion than we used to think, is of course historically interesting for Christians. But fundamentally the two religions are different and ought to be kept distinct. Hebraism gave birth, not to Christianity, but to Judaism, which throughout the centuries has been opposed to the central doctrine of the Christian faith and has pursued a path of its own. The opposition has been so persistent and has lasted so long that we may say that 'never the twain shall meet.' It has been the bane of Christianity that it has hesitated to face the facts of the situation and has shrunk from demanding equal freedom and emancipation. There

* Alfred Loisy, *La Religion d'Israel*. Troisième Édition, revue et augmentié. (Paris: Emile Nourry. 1933. pp. 328. 30 frs.)

is much that is admirable in Judaism, as Dr. Travers Herford has ably demonstrated, just as there is much that is admirable in the Muslim faith. But the Jews have on the whole unwaveringly repudiated Jesus, and Hebraism is no more the parent of Christianity than is Zoroastrianism. It must be insisted over and over again that if Christianity is to fulfil its mission, it must be free to pursue a path of its own. Herein lies its salvation.

M. Loisy's book created a sensation when it first appeared towards the end of 1900. In its new form it has been much enlarged, and the opening chapter, 'Les Sources,' which takes account of the apocryphal and apocalyptic literature as well as of the literature of the Old Testament, is entirely new. These improvements add considerably to the value of a book which has always had power to charm and stimulate its readers. M. Loisy never fails to merit our respect and attention.

MAURICE A. CANNEY.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE CURE OF LEPROSY.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

SIR,

Your readers may be interested in a remarkable development of work for the relief of leprosy — a disease unique in its age-long and world-wide record of physical and social misery. The incurable disease can now be cured. During the ten years from 1916, medical research, especially by Professor, now Sir Leonard, Rogers and Dr. Muir in Calcutta, discovered means, by injection of the derivatives of certain vegetable oils, of curing leprosy in its early stages. It was then obvious that if this treatment could be made available and the probability of cure at an early stage of the disease be made known, patients would come in for treatment rather than conceal the disease, for fear of its social consequences, till too late for cure. It was found, too, that in many of the cases of worst mutilation the disease was no longer contagious; there was no need for isolation.

In 1923 Rogers with influential support founded the British Empire Leprosy Relief Association (B.E.L.R.A.), which in ten years has established branches, conducted surveys, published literature, given financial support for the development and personnel of leprosy institutions, and supplied advice and drugs throughout the Empire. A strong Indian branch was established with an appeal from the Viceroy, Lord Reading, the number of cases in India alone being reckoned at 500,000. Eight branches have been established in the Colonial Empire, and ten branches in the chief areas of Great Britain. But, as is usual in such movements, the work and organization were settling into a groove; a fresh departure was required to bring the means of treatment home to the people who need it.

'Tubby' Clayton, founder of Toc H, returned last year from the British West African colonies, impressed with the ravages of leprosy and the possibilities of the modern treatment, coupled with the inability of the doctors in the institutions to bridge the gap between them and the masses of possible patients. He felt a challenge to send men out to bridge this gap; he thought of the fine material in the youth of Toc H. A small Special Committee was accordingly formed, representative of Toc H, B.E.L.R.A., the missionary societies and leprosy-workers, under Sir S. Wilson, late Permanent Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies. It was decided to recruit laymen to volunteer for a period of five years to assist the work in

leprosy colonies, on missionary terms of pay and expenses. Each volunteer will receive elementary medical training for nine months at Livingstone College, Leyton, or at the Leper Colony itself where he is to work. Six sponsors have come forward, each willing to provide £1,200 for the training and five years' support of one man. An appeal to Toc H for volunteers was at once met by some two hundred applications. Six men have been selected and are now about to enter on their course of training. The Colonial Office and Colonial authorities are giving active co-operation.

When these men have found their feet in the leper-institution to which they are to be posted, they will, it is hoped, be able to tour the countryside, to tell the people the facts of the new treatment, to enable them to recognise early cases, to persuade them to make use of the facilities available; to tell the chronic cases that many of them are 'burnt-out' and no longer contagious, or can become so under treatment; and to persuade their neighbours and native authorities to that effect. They will 'go out into the highways and hedges and compel them to come in.' They will be liaison-officers between the doctors and the people, multiplying the usefulness of the medical institutions indefinitely, and bring the possibility of a reduction of the disease to the normal level of other and minor diseases.

This opens up great possibilities in other fields than leprosy and great opportunities of useful service for young men of ideals and common sense. Leprosy is a most suitable field for the experiment. The influence of such men may well be pastoral in a wider sense. It is a suitable field for benevolence and your readers may know of possible benefactors. The Hon. Treasurer, Sir F. Carter, and the Medical Secretary, Dr. R. G. Cochrane, will gladly receive suggestions and answer inquiries at 131 Baker Street, London, W.1. Pamphlets and literature on the subject are available.

Bedwell Park, Hatfield, Herts. FRANCIS FREMANTLE.
October 4th, 1934.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TERM PROPITIATION.

SIR,

In the very interesting address by Dr. Major published in the October issue of the *Modern Churchman* he mentions, incidentally, that the view that Christ's death was a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of mankind was held by St. Paul. A propitiatory sacrifice as necessary to appease the gods is of course a prevalent idea among pagans, and had its place in the Hebrew ceremonial worship, but is it justifiable to assume that St. Paul accepted this conception, and applied it to the death of Christ? It has long seemed to me that it is not necessary to assume this.

There is one passage (I think only one) in his letters in which he applies the term propitiation (or propitiatory, *Rom.* iii, 25, R.V.) to our Lord. Dr. Fairweather in his book, *Jesus and the Greeks*, deals at length with the teaching of Philo and its influence on early Christian thought; in particular he enumerates various instances in which St. Paul's mode of treatment and phraseology show indications of familiarity with the writings of Philo; some of these are in the *Epistles to the Romans*. A man educated in the city of Tarsus would be likely to be acquainted with the works of this eminent contemporary philosopher. We are therefore justified in thinking that St. Paul probably used the term propitiation in a similar sense to that in which Philo used it. The translators of the Authorised Version of the New Testament have often rendered the same Greek word by different English words; in this instance as 'propitiatory,' or 'propitiation,' or

'Mercy-seat,' or 'merciful' (*St. Luke* xviii, 13; *Heb.* ix, 5; *Rom.* iii, 25; and *I John* ii, 3). Philo calls the Mercy-seat in the Temple the 'Propitiatory,' and, in his customary way, he treats it as an allegory; he says it was an imitation of the propitious power of God, which he defines as that whereby the Divine Artist compassionates His own work. St. Paul, who gloried in the assurance of God's love and mercy revealed in the self-sacrifice of Jesus even unto the death on the Cross, seems to have used the word in the same sense when he wrote that God had set forth (purposed—R.V.) Jesus to be propitiatory, to show forth His Righteousness in the forgiveness of the sins of all who trust in Him.

It is clear that St. Paul never meant to imply that forgiveness could do away with the law of consequences: he stresses that in *Rom.* ii, 6-9. The mischievous conception of propitiation as a method by which an evil-doer might escape penalty was wholly alien to his thought.

The Cross in which he gloried was the revelation of the 'length and breadth and depth and height' of the Righteousness of God's Love, from which he claims in this same epistle that nothing can separate him. To him it is clear that compassion and mercy are of the very essence of Divine righteousness; no *appeasement* of God is therefore necessary. Whilst he believes that the only right (righteous) attitude of man to God is one of absolute trust in the Divine Goodness, he also believes that God's attitude towards man, *i.e.* the *Right*eousness of God which reveals His faithfulness to faithful hearts (*Rom.* i, 17), is this Divine Love and pardon manifested in Jesus Christ. If we study *Rom.* iii with this in mind we understand why St. Paul calls Jesus 'the Propitiatory,' *i.e.* 'the Mercy-seat' in whom God has set forth His Nature and Will.

Of course, theologians have taught very differently; they have been prone to set mercy over against justice. 'In the course of justice,' Shakespeare wrote, 'none of us should see salvation.' But St. John in his first epistle says God is faithful and *just* to forgive us our sins 'when we repent'; justice and mercy are not opposites, but mercy is justice and justice is mercy, because Love is the very essence of God's Nature; not the sentimental impulse which some think can be made effective by the cry of man who wants to escape the result of his own actions, but an infinitely wise compassion which teaches by consequences and beareth all things in order to cleanse and save His children. Christ endured the Cross not to procure mercy but to manifest it.

HELEN ALEX DALLAS.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

SIR,

As I have written previously in your pages, I ask permission (especially in view of a letter of mine published in your November, 1933, issue) to make a personal statement. I would not trouble you with it were it personal only; but it involves some matters of principle of some importance. Also, the psychological, emotional, and intellectual problems involved in such cases are by no means uncommon sources of trouble, and deserve understanding.

In the middle of 1933 I was induced to attempt to return to the Roman Catholic Church, which previously I had left. I am not ashamed of having made that effort. For many years my life had been intimately associated with that Church, even to the extent of most precious personal ties. It is not surprising, therefore, that, even after having left it, I should have felt the loss of those associations and that my mind should entertain the idea that perhaps they were not permanently lost.

What had caused me to leave the Roman Catholic Church was repulsion from its extremely narrow and tyrannical system of government. However, there had not been a similar repulsion from its devotional and metaphysical outlook: indeed, on the devotional side there remained an intense fondness for 'the old ways.' It was that fact that made it not only possible, but inevitable, that I should try to return. However, what of the criticisms which, in various books and other writings, I had published of the Roman Catholic system? They were honest and true, and — at any rate, as statements of fact, distinguished from logical inductions from such facts—could not be withdrawn. Certain Roman Catholic friends, however, represented to me that such withdrawal was not necessary, but that the case could be explained by a 'formula,' namely, that 'the evils in the Church' were and are due to the faults of its Roman members, and not to its essential constitution. In other words, a distinction between 'essentials' and 'non-essentials' would suffice.

It must be admitted that such a 'formula' would not have 'sufficed' had not my emotional tendencies been predisposed to entertain it. However, entertain it I did, and on that basis rejoined 'Rome' (July, 1933).

As remarked above, there is no need to be ashamed of this 'venture of faith' (as I called it at the time). My disillusionment with 'Rome' had been incomplete; it had left too many emotional feelings behind it. A further experience was needful to destroy that 'Janus-like' attitude.

Such experience has had a very definite and final result. Except in one or two special cases, I have no complaint to make of personal unkindness from Roman Catholics; indeed, some have been very kind. What I am now saying relates not to individuals but to 'the ecclesiastical machine.' The fact is, not only are the evils which formerly drove me from 'Rome' as bad as ever, but they are worse than I realised then. It is vain to try to explain them by 'formulae.' They affect the very constitution of the Roman Catholic Church, and so disprove its exclusive claims. Such persons as myself, then, must definitely and finally recognise that love of truth and liberty makes membership of the Roman Catholic Church impossible. I may add that there is no intention on my part of taking up a bitter controversial attitude. What are needed are calm, impartial statements of fact. On the psychological, emotional, and intellectual problems which, at the beginning of this letter, were alluded to as being implied in such cases, much of valuable interest can be written; but I must leave them for other opportunities.

106 Gillespie Road, Highbury,
London, N.5.
August 3rd, 1934.

J. W. POYNTER.

SIR,

PROF. BURKITT'S *DICTUM.*

In his paper in the Conference number Professor Burkitt says, 'There is now no conflict between Religion and Science; we hear that proclaimed in sermons. It is not so often added that this is because religion has abandoned all the points at issue.'

Is this not to carry self-depreciation too far? So far as the conflict in question has abated, is this not due to a two-fold change, an abandonment of claims to a supernatural knowledge of mundane events on the one side, and an abandonment of cocksureness and of a certain type of materialism on the other?

J. C. NUNNS.

St. John's, Little Thurrock.
October 20th, 1934.

THE EPISTLES & GOSPELS FOR THE SUNDAYS & GREATER HOLY DAYS OF THE CHRISTIAN YEAR

A New Translation, together with a selection of New Prayers

By

The Rev. T. F. ROYDS, B.D.

2s. 6d. net

"The little book is an interesting experiment and repays the trouble of detailed examination."

—*The Times Literary Supplement*

BASIL BLACKWELL : OXFORD

WORTHING (Sussex) BONACRE. The Estate Agents — Property Booklet forwarded on Request—Car supplied to meet Trains to inspect Properties in any District.—Tel. 1100.

Enquiries for
ADVERTISEMENT SPACE
in the
MODERN CHURCHMAN
should be sent to the sole advertising contractors
A. DARBY'S ADVERTISING SERVICE
Cobham House,
24 & 26 Water Lane, London, E.C.4.
Telegrams : City 6686-7
Telegrams : "Darbiads," Cent, London.

ST. BRANDON'S, BRISTOL

CLERGY DAUGHTERS' SCHOOL
(Founded 1831)

Hon. Secretary :
The Rev. C. S. L. Alford, M.A. (Cantab.).

Headmistress :
Miss E. M. Almond, M.A. (Oxon.).

FEES :

Non-Foundationers (Daughters of Laity and Clergy), £120 per annum.

Foundationers (Daughters of Clergy only), £70—£73 per annum.

One Clergy Daughter Scholarship, March, 1935.

A Site of 18 acres has been recently purchased on the summit of Henbury Hill (outskirts of Bristol), to which it is intended to move the School as soon as funds for building are available.

Apply HEAD MISTRESS.

OUR NATIONAL CHURCH

BY

CANON PERCY DEARMER, D.D.

Dr. Dearmer, writing of the England of to-day, surveys the whole issue of Church and State, and reviews the National Church in its most comprehensive conception. 'For to-day Christianity must save civilisation or perish with it.'

'The modern world demands that religion should be expressed in a large way, and rooted in the past, as great institutions are: for the day of small separated religious communities has passed away. Now that men are no longer grounded in one place or fixed in one class, and now that people are no longer so sure of any particular theory or system. . . .'

SIX SHILLINGS NET

NISBET

The New Church Missionary & Tract Society.

Three uniform, cloth-bound, demy 8vo, volumes

BY THE LATE

REV. WILLIAM BRUCE

'Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew'
682 pages

'Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John'
522 pages

'Commentary on the Revelation of St. John'
458 pages

Price 4/- each net

These works are expositions of the inner meaning of the sacred Scriptures, and demonstrate that the Gospel records of our Lord's Life and Teaching are 'given by inspiration of God and are profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.'

They will be found illuminating and suggestive by all preachers and teachers.

Specimen Sheets will be sent post free on application to the Society's Agents :—
NEW-CHURCH PRESS, Ltd., Swedenborg House, 20 Hart St., Bloomsbury Square,
or the books may be inspected at this address without obligation. **W.C.1**